arXiv:1510.07124v1 [cs.CC] 24 Oct 2015

Space complexity of list H-coloring revisited: the case of oriented trees*

László Egri

Simon Fraser University

October 27, 2015

Abstract

Digraphs H for which the list homomorphism problem with template H (LHOM(H)) is in logspace (L) was characterized by Egri et al. (SODA 2014): LHOM(H) is in L if and only if H does not contain a circular N.[1] *Undirected* graphs for which LHOM(H) is in L can be characterized in terms forbidden induced subgraphs, and also via a simple inductive construction (Egri et al., STACS 2010). As a consequence, the logspace algorithm in the undirected case is simple and easy to understand. No such forbidden subgraph or inductive characterization, and no such simple and easy-to-understand algorithm is known in the case of digraphs. In this paper, *in the case of oriented trees*, we refine and strengthen the results of Egri et al. (SODA 2014): we give a characterization of oriented trees T for which LHOM(T) is in L both in terms of forbidden induced subgraphs, and also via a simple inductive construction. Using this characterization, we obtain a simple and easy-to-analyze logspace algorithm for LHOM(T). We also show how these oriented trees can be recognized in time $O(|V(T)|^3)$ (the straightforward implementation of the algorithm given in SODA 2014 runs in time $O(|V(H)|^8)$ for oriented trees). An algebraic characterization of these trees is also provided.

1 Introduction

Given two digraphs G and H, a homomorphism $\varphi : G \to H$ is a mapping $\varphi : V(G) \to V(H)$ such that $uv \in A(G)$ implies that $\varphi(u)\varphi(v) \in A(H)$, where $A(G)$ denotes the arc set of G. The corresponding algorithmic problem *Digraph Homomorphism* asks if G has a homomorphism to H. For example, it is easy to see that G has a homomorphism into the clique K_c if and only if G is c-colorable. Instead of digraphs, one can consider homomorphism problems in the more general context of relational structures. Feder and Vardi [7] observed that the standard framework for the Constraint Satisfaction Problem (CSP) can be formulated as homomorphism problems for relational structures. In fact, they showed that every such problem is equivalent to a Digraph Homomorphism problem, hence Digraph Homomorphism is as expressive as the CSP in general.

The expressive power of Digraph Homomorphism can be increased by introducing lists. Given digraphs G and H and a list $L(v) \subseteq V(H)$ for each $v \in V(G)$, a *list homomorphism* φ from G to H is a homomorphism from G to H such that $\varphi(v) \in L(v)$ for each $v \in V(G)$. The *List Homomorphism problem with template H* (LHOM(H)) is the following algorithmic problem. Given

*This research was supported by NSERC.

[1] Assuming L $\neq$ NL.

a digraph G and a list $L(v)$ for each $v \in V(G)$, decide if there is a list homomorphism from G to H.[2] The List Homomorphism problem was introduced by Feder and Hell in 1998 [8], and it has been studied since then extensively [5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12].

In this paper, we study List Homomorphism problems of logarithmic space complexity. Such problems with graph and digraph templates have been studied in [5, 4, 2]. When H is an undirected graph, LHOM(H) is in logspace[3] (L) if and only if H does not contain any of a certain set of graphs as an induced subgraph, or equivalently, if H can be inductively constructed using two simple operations (see [5] for details). We call these graphs *skew decomposable*. Relying on this inductive construction, the logspace algorithm for LHOM(H) is remarkably simple. When H is a *digraph*, LHOM(H) is in L if and only if H does not contain a so-called *circular* N (see [4]). We note that H not containing a circular N is *not* a forbidden induced subgraph characterization. Although the lack of a circular N in H gives a unifying reason why LHOM(H) is in L, the first of the two existing logspace algorithms for LHOM(H) is quite complicated (see [4]), and the second algorithm (*a symmetric Datalog program*) requires an involved and technical analysis, which is the subject of [2]. This is in stark contrast to the simple and easy-to-analyze logspace algorithm for LHOM(H) when H is a skew decomposable undirected graph [5]. Whether digraphs for which LHOM(H) is in L can be characterized in terms of forbidden induced subgraphs, whether they enjoy an inductive construction, and whether such a construction could be used to build a simple logspace algorithm for LHOM(H) are intriguing open problems. In this paper, we answer these questions for oriented trees in the positive. (We remark that our results re-prove the L $-$ NL dichotomy for LHOM(T) when T is an oriented tree.)

Graphs and digraphs H for which LHOM(H) is in L form a natural class, and we believe that our inductive characterization of such oriented trees could be of independent interest. In fact, the FPT-algorithm in [1] uses the inductive characterization of skew decomposable graphs in an essential way.

Detailed results and structure of the paper: In Section 2, we introduce basic concepts and define an oriented path we call Z_6, and a class of oriented paths we call fuzzy N-s. In Section 3, we describe a way to construct oriented trees inductively (Definition 3.1). We proceed to prove the main combinatorial result of the paper: an oriented tree T contains a Z_6 or a fuzzy N as an induced subgraph if and only if T can be constructed using the inductive construction in Definition 3.1 (Theorem 3.2). In Section 4, we briefly argue that if a tree T contains a Z_6 or a fuzzy N as an induced subgraph, then LHOM(T) is NL-hard. Then for oriented trees T that do not contain any such induced subgraph, we provide a simple logspace algorithm relying on the aforementioned inductive characterization of T. In Section 5, we give an *unconditional* proof that an oriented tree contains a circular N if and only if T contains a Z_6 or a fuzzy N as an induced subgraph. (Note that if we assume that L $\neq$ NL, then there is a simpler argument.) In Section 6, we show that T does not contain a Z_6 or a fuzzy N as an induced subgraph if and only if T admits a *Hagemann-Mitschke chain of conservative polymorphisms of length* 3 (note that this is similar to the characterization of undirected graphs in [5]). We also give an example of a digraph in Section 6 that admits a Hagemann-Mitschke chain of conservative polymorphisms of length $n+1$ but not of length n (Theorem 6.4). Therefore we can conclude that in this respect, general digraphs behave differently from oriented trees. In Section 7, we give a $O(|V(T)|^3)$ algorithm to recognize oriented trees that do not contain a Z_6 or a fuzzy N as an induced subgraph. This is significantly faster than the $O(|V(T)|^8)$-time implementation of the recognition algorithm in [4] restricted oriented

[2] We remark that LHOM(H) is identical to CSP($\mathbb{B}$), where $\mathbb{B}$ is the relational structure that contains the binary relation that is the arc set of the digraph H, and a unary relation $U_S = S$ for each $S \subseteq V(H)$.

[3] These results assume that L $\neq$ NL.

tree inputs.[4]

For the sake of completeness, Appendix A contains both an inductive construction and an "explicit" characterization of oriented paths that contain no Z_6 or fuzzy N as an induced subgraph.

We summarize the main results of this paper in Theorem 1.1. Note that some parts of this theorem come from [4], as explained below.

Theorem 1.1. *Let T be an oriented tree. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *T contains no induced subgraph that is a Z_6 or a fuzzy* N*;*
2. *T can be constructed inductively as in Definition 3.1;*
3. *T contains no circular* N*;*
4. *T admits a chain of conservative Hagemann-Mitschke polymorphisms of length* 3*;*
5. *T admits a chain of conservative Hagemann-Mitschke polymorphisms of length n, for some $n \geq 1$.*

If the above conditions hold, then LHOM(T) *is in* L*. Otherwise* LHOM(T) *is* NL*-hard.*

The outline of the proof of this theorem is the following:[5]

- (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) is the content of Lemma 3.9.
- (2) $\Rightarrow$ (4) is the content of Lemma 6.2.
- (4) $\Rightarrow$ (5) is trivial.
- (5) $\Rightarrow$ (3) is by [4].
- (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) is the content of Lemma 5.3.

It is shown in [4] that if T contains no circular N then LHOM(T) is in L, and otherwise LHOM(T) is NL-hard. However, as discussed above, the merit of the logspace algorithm in this paper is its simple inductive nature.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Digraphs and related concepts

Let G be a digraph. (All digraphs in this paper are finite.) An arc of G from vertex a to vertex b is denoted by ab. We call a and b the *endpoints* of ab. If we want to be more specific, we call a the *tail* and b the *head* of ab. If $v \in V(G)$ we call u an *inneighbour* (*outneighbours*) of v if $uv \in A(G)$ ($vu \in A(G)$). The *indegree (outdegree)* of a vertex is the number of its inneighbours (outneighbours). A digraph G is *connected* if the undirected graph obtained from G by replacing arcs with undirected edges (the *underlying undirected graph*) is connected. For a disconnected digraph G, a *component* of G is a maximal subgraph that is connected.

[4]Note that $O(|V(T)|^8)$ is the running time of the straightforward implementation of the recognition algorithm (in [4]) when inputs are assumed to be oriented trees. We also note that this algorithm runs faster on trees than on general digraphs. We made no attempt to improve the running time of this algorithm. See Appendix A.

[5]In Appendix B, we give direct proofs that (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) and (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3), and we also give a not direct but short proof that (4) $\Rightarrow$ (1).

If $V(G)$ can be partitioned into non-empty sets called *vertex levels* $L_0, \ldots, L_n$ such that for each arc ab, $a \in L_i$ and $b \in L_{i+1}$ for some $i < n$, then we call G *leveled*. Observe that if a connected digraph is leveled, then the partition $L_0, \ldots, L_n$ is unique. We call L_0 the *bottom* vertex level and L_n the *top* vertex level. For a vertex $v \in V$, we say that v *is in the bottom (top) level if* $v \in L_0$ *($v \in L_n$)*. Given a vertex v of G, we use $\ell(v)$ to denote the index such that $v \in L_{\ell(v)}$. For $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, we denote the set of arcs of G with one endpoint in L_i and the other one in L_{i+1} with $\mathcal{L}_i$. We call $\mathcal{L}_i$ the *i-th arc level* of G. We define *bottom* and *top arc levels* in the natural way. If we need to be explicit, we write L_i^G ($\mathcal{L}_i^G$) instead of L_i ($\mathcal{L}_i$) to mean the i-th vertex (arc) level of digraph G. Note that we can think of $\mathcal{L}_i$ as a digraph, and we will often do so without explicitly mentioning. Also note that if u is a vertex in L_i or L_{i+1} such that u is not the endpoint of an arc in $\mathcal{L}_i$ then u *does not* belong to the digraph $\mathcal{L}_i$. Given an arc a of G, we use $\ell(a)$ to denote the index such that $a \in \mathcal{L}_{\ell(a)}$. (Note that using ℓ for both vertex and arc levels will cause no confusion.)

Given a digraph G, $r(G)$ denotes the digraph obtained from G by replacing every arc ab with ba. An *oriented walk* W is a sequence of vertices $a_1 a_2 \ldots a_m$, where precisely one of $a_i a_{i+1}$ or $a_{i+1} a_i$ is an arc. Arc $a_i a_{i+1}$ is called a *forward* arc, and $a_{i+1} a_i$ a *backward* arc. Let $W = a_1 a_2 \ldots a_m$ be an oriented walk. An *oriented path* is a *simple* oriented walk, i.e., each vertex in the walk appears only once. Suppose that e is an arc of W with endpoints a_j and a_{j+1}, and e' is an arc of W with endpoints a_{k-1} and a_k (note that both e or e' could be backward or forward). Then $W(a_j, a_k)$ (a walk from vertex a_j to a_k), $W(e, a_k)$ (a walk from arc e to vertex a_k), $W(a_j, e')$ (a walk from a vertex a_j to arc e') and $W(e, e')$ (a walk from arc e to arc e') all denote the subwalk $a_j a_{j+1} \ldots a_k$ of W. For an oriented path $W = a_1 a_2 \ldots a_m$, there is a natural total order $\preceq$ on its vertices, i.e., $a_i \preceq a_j$ if and only if $i \leq j$. This order helps us refer to parts of W: the *first* and *last* vertices of W are a_1 and a_n, respectively. A vertex a_i of W is *before* (*after*) a_j if $i \preceq j$ ($j \preceq i$). We use $\bar{W}$ to denote the path that is isomorphic to W, but the order associated with the path is reversed, i.e., $\bar{W} = a_m a_{m-1} \ldots a_1$. If $P = a_1 \ldots a_n$ and $Q = b_1 \ldots b_m$ are two oriented paths, then PQ is the *concatenation* of P and Q, i.e., the oriented path $P = a_1 \ldots a_n b_2 \ldots b_m$, where we identify the last vertex of P, a_n, and the first vertex of Q, b_1 (i.e., the arc on vertices a_n and b_2 is $a_n b_2$ if $b_1 b_2$ is an arc of Q, and it is $b_2 a_n$ if $b_2 b_1$ is an arc of Q). The *height* of an oriented walk W, denoted by $height(W)$, is the number of different vertex levels in which W contains at least one vertex minus 1. If $\ell(a_1) < \ell(a_n)$, then we say W is an *upward* walk, and if $\ell(a_1) > \ell(a_n)$, then we say that P is a *downward* walk. (When $\ell(a_1) = \ell(a_n)$, the walk is neither upward nor downward.) The *net length* of an oriented path is the number of forward arcs minus the number of backward arcs in the walk, and it is denoted by $net(W)$.

An *oriented tree* is a digraph such that the underlying undirected graph is a tree. Observe that an oriented tree T is always leveled. Furthermore, let a be a vertex or an arc of T, and let b also be a vertex or an arc of T. Then observe that since T is a tree, the oriented path $P(a, b)$ is unique.

In what follows, when we say that digraph X is *of the form* Y, where Y is digraph, we mean that there is an isomorphism between X and Y. Similarly, saying that digraph X *is* a Y means X is isomorphic to Y.

Definition 2.1. *Z_i^s, where $1 \leq i$ and $s \in \{f = 0, f = 1, l = 0, l = 1\}$, is used to denote oriented paths of the following form. Z_i^s is of the form $a_1 \ldots a_i$, where if $a_j a_{j+1}$ is a forward (backward) arc, then $a_{j+1} a_{j+2}$ is a backward (forward arc) arc. Observe that it is always the case that $height(\mathrm{Z}_i^s) = 1$, and therefore Z_i^s has two vertex levels, a bottom level L_0 and a top level L_1. The superscripts $f = 0$ and $f = 1$ stand for the first vertex a_1 being in L_0 and L_1, respectively. Similarly, the superscripts $l = 0$ and $l = 1$ stand for the last vertex a_i being in L_0 and L_1, respectively. Z_i stands for either $\mathrm{Z}_i^{f=0}$ or $\mathrm{Z}_i^{f=1}$. Observe that Z_1 is a single vertex. Z stands for Z_i for some i. A $\mathrm{Z}_6^{f=0}$ can be seen in Figure 1.*

Definition 2.2. *Let n be a positive integer. We say that a digraph P is a* fuzzy path *if P or $\bar{P}$ is of the form $P_1P_2\dots P_n$, where*

- *If $n = 1$, then P_1 is Z_i, where $1 \le i \le 5$.*
- *If $n \ge 2$, then P_1 is $\mathrm{Z}_i^{l=1}$ for some $i \le 5$, and $P_n = \mathrm{Z}_j^{f=0}$ for some $j \le 5$.*
- *For each $1 < i < n$, P_i is either of the form $\mathrm{Z}_2^{f=0}$, or $\mathrm{Z}_4^{f=0}$.*

A fuzzy path P is minimal*, if it has only one vertex in both L_0 and $L_{height(P)}$.*

An oriented path P is a fuzzy N *if P is of the form $P_1T\bar{P}_2BP_3$, where P_1, P_2 and P_3 are minimal fuzzy paths of the same height, and height at least 2, T is of the form Z_1 or $\mathrm{Z}_3^{f=1}$, and B is of the form Z_1 or $\mathrm{Z}_3^{f=0}$. A fuzzy* N *is illustrated in Figure 1.*



Figure 1: A fuzzy N in which T is a single vertex (top left), and a $\mathrm{Z}_6^{f=0}$ (bottom left). The up-join of T_0, T_1, T_2, T_3 (right).

2.2 Homomorphisms and polymorphisms

The List Homomorphism problem LHOM(H) has already been defined in the Introduction. Let G and H be leveled connected digraphs. Notice that any (list)-homomorphism h from G to H must be *level-preserving*:

- if L^G is a vertex level of G, then $h(L^G) \subseteq L^H$, where L^H is some vertex level of H, and
- if $u \in L_i^G$ and $v \in L_{i'}^G$, where L_i^G and $L_{i'}^G$ are some vertex levels of G ($0 \le i, i' \le height(G)$), then $\ell(h(u)) - \ell(h(v)) = i - i'$.

This level-preserving property of homomorphisms will be used implicitly.

Definition 2.3. *Let H be a digraph. An operation $f : V(H)^m \to V(H)$ is a polymorphism of H if $f(v_{11}, v_{12}, \dots, v_{1m})f(v_{21}, v_{22}, \dots, v_{2m}) \in A(H)$ whenever $v_{11}v_{21}, v_{12}v_{22}, \dots, v_{1m}v_{2m} \in A(H)$. Operation f is* conservative *if $f(v_1, \dots, v_m) \in \{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$. A sequence $f_1, \dots, f_k$ of ternary operations is called a* Hagemann-Mitschke chain of length k *if it satisfies the identities*

- $x = f_1(x, y, y)$
- $f_i(x, x, y) = f_{i+1}(x, y, y)$ *for all* $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$
- $f_k(x, x, y) = y$.

We say that H admits *an HM-chain* $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_k$ *if each* f_i *is a polymorphism of* H.

3 A structural characterization

In this section, we define an inductive construction of oriented trees, and show that oriented trees that can be constructed this way are precisely the oriented trees that do not contain a Z_6 or fuzzy N as an induced subgraph (Theorem 3.2).

Definition 3.1 (Inductive construction)**.** *Let* $T_0, T_1, \ldots, T_n$ *be oriented trees.*

1. *Let* v_0 *be a vertex in the bottom vertex level of* T_0*;*
2. *Let* v_i *be a vertex of* T_i*, for each* $1 \leq i \leq n$*, either in the top (bottom) vertex level of* T_i*, or such that* v_i *is the only vertex in* $L^{T_i}_{\ell(v_i)}$ *with out-degree (in-degree) greater than* 0*.*

The up-join (down-join) *of* $T_0, T_1, \ldots, T_n$ *is the oriented tree obtained by taking the disjoint union of* T_i *for* $1 \leq i \leq n$*, and adding all arcs* $v_i v_0$ *(*$v_0 v_i$*) for each* $1 \leq i \leq n$*. An example of this construction is given in Figure 1.*

We call T_0 *the* central tree*,* v_0 *the* central vertex*, and* v_i*, where* $1 \leq i \leq n$*, the* join vertices*. When we specify a list of trees and we take their up-join (down-join) the first tree in the list is always meant to be the central tree.*

If G *is an oriented tree with a single vertex, we say that* G *is* constructible*. Inductively, if* $T_0, T_1, \ldots, T_n$ *are constructible, then their up-join and down-join (for some central and join vertices satisfying the conditions above) are also* constructible*.*

The main structural result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *An oriented tree is constructible if and only if* T *contains neither* Z_6*, nor a fuzzy* N *as an induced subgraph.*

We need the following lemma a number of times to prove the existence of fuzzy N's.

Lemma 3.3. *Let* P *be an oriented path. Then* P *contains vertices* b_1, t_1, b_2, t_2 *with the following properties:*

1. *when we traverse* P *from first vertex to last vertex, we encounter* b_1, t_1, b_2, t_2 *in this order,*
2. b_1 *and* b_2 *are in* L_x *for some* x*, and* t_1 *and* t_2 *are in* L_y *for some* y*, where* $y \geq x + 2$*,*
3. *no vertex of* $P(b_1, t_2)$ *is in level* L_{x-1} *or level* L_{y+1}*,*

if and only if P *contains a fuzzy* N*.*

Proof. Suppose that P contains vertices b_1, t_1, b_2, t_2 with the above properties. Suppose that there is a path Q among $P(b_1, t_1)$, $\bar{P}(b_2, t_1)$ or $P(b_2, t_2)$ such that Q contains vertices b'_1, t'_1, b'_2, t'_2 with same properties as b_1, t_1, b_2, t_2 in P, respectively. Then we work with Q instead of P. Repeating this argument sufficiently many times, we can assume without loss of generality that each arc level

of each subpath $P(b_1, t_1)$, $\bar{P}(b_2, t_1)$ and $P(b_2, t_2)$ of P contains only one component of the given subpath. Since in addition, none of $P(b_1, t_1)$, $\bar{P}(b_2, t_1)$ and $P(b_2, t_2)$ contain Z_6 as an induced subgraph, each of $P(b_1, t_1)$, $\bar{P}(b_2, t_1)$ and $P(b_2, t_2)$ satisfies the 3 conditions in Definition 2.2. Therefore these subpaths are fuzzy. By throwing away unnecessary vertices, we can also assume that b_1 and t_2 are the only vertices of $P(b_1, t_1)$ and $P(b_2, t_2)$ in L_x and L_y, respectively.

Now it is easy to see that $P(b_1, t_2)$ is a fuzzy N: let t'_1 be the first vertex of $P(b_1, t_1)$ in L_y, and let t''_1 the last vertex of $\bar{P}(b_2, t_1)$ in L_y. Let $T = P(t'_1, t''_1)$. Similarly, let b'_2 the first vertex of $\bar{P}(b_2, t_1)$ in L_x, and let b''_2 be the last vertex of $P(b_2, t_2)$ in L_x. Let $B = P(b'_2, b''_2)$. Then $P(b_1, t'_1)T\bar{P}(b'_2, t''_1)BP(b''_2, t_2)$ is a fuzzy N.

The converse is straightforward. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let P be an oriented path containing no Z_6 or fuzzy N as induced subgraphs. If the first vertex of P is in the bottom level of P, and the last vertex of P is in the top level of P, then P is a fuzzy path.*

Proof. Let the first and last vertices of P be s and t, respectively. Assume for contradiction that P contains a vertex t'_1 before a vertex b'_2 such that $\ell(t_1) \geq \ell(b_2) + 2$. Let t_1 be a vertex of $P(s, t'_1)$ in L_a where a is maximal. Let b_2 be a vertex of $P(t'_1, t)$ in L_b such that b is minimal.

Since $\ell(s) \leq \ell(b_2)$ and $\ell(t_1) \leq \ell(t)$, we can find b_1 (before t_1 and t_2 (after b_2) such that b_1, t_1, b_2, t_2 satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.3, and therefore P contains a fuzzy N as induced subgraph, a contradiction. Therefore if $P = a_1 \dots a_n$, then for any $i < j$, $\ell(a_i) \leq \ell(a_j) + 1$. Since P does not contain Z_6 as an induced subgraph, we conclude that P must be fuzzy. □

Lemma 3.5 is the main technical result used in the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Lemma 3.5. *Let T be an oriented tree. Assume that T does not contain a Z_6 or a fuzzy N as an induced subgraph. Then there is an arc level $\mathcal{L}$ of T that contains at most one component.*

Proof. In this proof, L_i and $\mathcal{L}_i$ always refer to vertex and arc levels of T, respectively. Similarly, the function $\ell(\cdot)$ gives the index of the vertex level or arc level of a vertex or arc of T, respectively. Choose two arbitrary vertices $b \in L_0$ and $t \in L_{height(T)}$. Let S denote the (unique) path $P(b, t)$. Path S is fixed for the rest of the proof. By Lemma 3.4, S is a fuzzy. Since S is a fuzzy path, there is a component C_i of the digraph $\mathcal{L}_i$ (for all $0 \leq i \leq height(T)$), such that all arcs of S in $\mathcal{L}_i$ belong to the component C_i. We say that an arc $d \in A(T)$ in $\mathcal{L}_i$ is *separated from S* if d does not belong to C_i. We can assume that there is a separated arc in $\mathcal{L}_i$ for each $0 \leq i \leq height(T) - 1$, because otherwise we would have the desired property stated in the lemma. We use the existence of these separated arcs to obtain a contradiction.

We will inductively fix a sequence of paths $F_0, \dots, F_q$ in T. For each $0 \leq i \leq q$, A_i will denote the set of arcs of F_i that are separated from S. To define F_0, we find a separated arc a'_0 in $\mathcal{L}_0$, and let F'_0 be the unique oriented path from t (recall that t is the last vertex of S in L_n) to a'_0. Let c_0 be the last common vertex of S and F'_0, and a_0 be the first separated arc of $F'_0(c_0, a'_0)$ in $\mathcal{L}_0$. Then F_0 is the subpath $F'_0(c_0, a_0)$.

Assuming that $F_0, \dots, F_{i-1}$ have been defined, we define F_i inductively as follows. If for each $0 \leq j \leq height(T) - 1$, there is an index j', such that $\mathcal{L}_j \cap A_{j'} \neq \emptyset$, that is, for each arc level of T, some $A_{j'}$ contains a separated arc of that arc level, then we set $q = i - 1$, and the construction of the paths $F_0, \dots, F_q$ is completed. Otherwise, let m be minimum such that there is no (separated) arc in $A_0 \cup \dots \cup A_{i-1}$ that is in $\mathcal{L}_m$, and let a'_i be a separated arc of T in $\mathcal{L}_m$. Let F'_i be the unique oriented path from t to a'_i. Let c_i be the last common vertex of S and F'_i, and a_i be the first separated arc of $F'_i(c_i, a'_i)$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(a'_i)}$. Then F_i is defined as the subpath $F'_i(c_i, a_i)$.

Claim 1. *F_i is a fuzzy path for all $0 \leq i \leq q$.*

Proof. We show first that F_0 is fuzzy. Since $a_0 = u_0v_0$ is the first separated arc of F_0 in $\mathcal{L}_0$, the last vertex of F_0 is u_0, and therefore it is in L_0. To see this, assume for contradiction that the last vertex of F_0 is v_0 (in L_1). Suppose the arc of F_0 before a_0 is u_0w_0 for some w_0 (since u_0 is in L_0, it has no inneighbours; u_0w_0 is not an arc of S, because if it was, then u_0v_0 would not be separated). Since a_0 is the first separated arc of F_0, u_0w_0 cannot be separated. But that is not possible, because arcs u_0v_0 and u_0w_0 have the same starting vertex, so they are in the same component of $\mathcal{L}_0$.

Since $u_0 \in L_0$ and $t \in L_n$, $P(u_0, t)$ is fuzzy by Lemma 3.4. Since F_0 is a subpath of $P(u_0, t)$, F_0 is also a fuzzy path.

Recall that a_i is the first separated arc of $F'_i(c_i, a'_i)$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(a'_i)}$, so a_i is either in the top or the bottom arc level of F_i. Suppose not. Then there are arcs $e \in \mathcal{L}_j$ and $e' \in \mathcal{L}_{j'}$ of F_i such that $j > \ell(a'_i)$ and $j' < \ell(a'_i)$. Therefore $F_i(e, e')$ contains an arc f in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(a'_i)}$, and clearly, f is separated. This would contradict that a_i is the first arc of $F'_i(c_i, a'_i)$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(a'_i)}$.

Suppose that $a_i = uv$ is in the bottom arc level of F_i. Recall that a_i is the first separated arc of $F'_i(c_i, a'_i)$. Assume first that a_i is the only arc of F_i in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(a'_i)}$. Then the last vertex of F_i is u, and u is also the only vertex of F_i in the bottom vertex level of F_i. Therefore $\ell(c_i) > \ell(u)$ (recall that c_i is the only common vertex of S and F_i), and since S is fuzzy, u is in the bottom vertex level also of $P(u, t)$ (but it is possible that $P(u, t)$ contains other vertices in its bottom vertex level). Since vertex u is in the bottom vertex level of $P(u, t)$, and vertex t is in its top level, it follows from Lemma 3.4 that $P(u, t)$ is fuzzy. Since F_i is a subpath of $P(u, t)$, F_i must also be fuzzy.

Assume therefore that a_i is not the only arc of F_i in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(a'_i)}$. Let e be the first non-separated arc of F_i in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(a'_i)}$. Such an arc can be only the first arc of F_i, and therefore one of the endpoints of e is c_i. If c_i is the head of e, then since S is fuzzy, all vertices of the subpath $P(c_i, t)$ of S are in a vertex level L_k, where $k \geq \ell(u)$. That is u is in the bottom vertex level of $P(u, t)$. So as above, $P(u, t)$ must be fuzzy, and therefore F_i is fuzzy. (However, if F_i is fuzzy and e and a_i are in the same arc level, then $P(e, a_i)$ is a Z, and therefore since e is not separated, a_i cannot be separated either. Therefore such an F_i cannot exist.)

If c_i is the tail of e, then let d be the vertex of $P(c_i, t)$ after c_i. The arc on vertices c_i and d must be a forward arc c_id, since otherwise e would be separated. Since $d \in L_{\ell(u)+1}$ and S is fuzzy, all vertices of $P(c_i, t)$ are in a vertex level L_k, where $k \geq \ell(u)$, and we proceed as above.

If a_i is in the top level of F_i, then a similar argument works using $P(s, v)$ instead of $P(u, t)$. □

Claim 2. *For each $0 \leq i \leq q$, F_i is either a downward or an upward (fuzzy) path.*

Proof. Assume that $F_i = w_0w_1 \dots w_n$ (note that $w_0 = c_i$). Suppose for contradiction that $\ell(w_0) = \ell(w_n)$. This implies that F_i must have at least two arcs. Since F_i is fuzzy, it must be that $height(F_i) \leq 2$, because if the height is more than 2, it is not possible that $\ell(w_0) = \ell(w_n)$. If $height(F_i) = 1$, then the last two arcs of F_i are either $w_{n-1}w_{n-2}$ and $w_{n-1}w_n$, or $w_{n-2}w_{n-1}$ and w_nw_{n-1}. In both cases, if the last arc of F_i is separated, then so is the second last arc. This contradicts the definition of F_i, namely, that its last arc is the first separated arc in that arc level.

If $height(F_i) = 2$, then it still must be that the last two arcs of F_i are either $w_{n-1}w_{n-2}$ and $w_{n-1}w_n$, or $w_{n-2}w_{n-1}$ and w_nw_{n-1}, so we can argue similarly. □

Let F_i ($0 \leq i \leq q$) be a fuzzy downward (upward) path that contains a separated arc. Let e be the first arc of F_i.

- We say that F_i is type 1 if e is not separated;
- We say that F_i is type 2 if e is separated and e is a backward (forward) arc of F_i;

- We say that F_i is type 3 if e is separated and e is a forward (backward) arc of F_i.

Claim 3. *Let $0 \leq i \leq q$ be an integer such that F_i is downward (upward) and type 3. Then T contains a fuzzy* N.

Proof. Since the first arc e of F_i is a forward arc and e is separated, c_i cannot have an outneighbours in S. (If S has an outneighbor v_o at c_i then, e would be in the same component of $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(e)}$ as $c_i v_0$, contradicting that e is separated.) Since F_i is downward, F_i must have an arc in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(e)-1}$. Let $b_1 v$ be the first arc of F_i in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(e)-1}$. Let t_1 be the outneighbor of c_i in F_i. Let b_2 be the in neighbor of c_i in $S(c_i, t)$, and let t_2 be the first vertex of $S(c_i, t)$ in $L_{\ell(t_1)}$. It is easy to check that b_1, t_1, b_2, t_2 satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.3, so T contains a fuzzy N. The argument is analogous when F_i is an upward path. □

Claim 4. *Let $1 \leq i \leq q$. Let e be the first arc of F_i. Either all arcs of F_i are separated, or arcs of F_i in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(e)}$ are non-separated, and all other arcs of F_i are separated.*

Proof. Assume first that e is separated. If e' is non-separated, then the path $F_i(c_i, e')$ must be a Z, since by definition, e' must be in the same component of $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(e')}$ as some arc of S. But since e is the first arc of F_i, $F_i(c_i, e')$ contains e, so e is also in the same component as e', and therefore e' is also non-separated. This is a contradiction. So all arcs of F_i are separated.

Assume that e is non-separated. Let e' be any arc of F_i. If $e' \in \mathcal{L}_{\ell(e)}$, then since F_i is fuzzy, by Claim 1, $F_i(e, e')$ must be a Z, and therefore e' is also non-separated. If e' is not in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(e)}$, then the path $F_i(c_i, e')$ is not a Z, so e' cannot be connected to an arc of S inside one arc level. □

By Claims 2 and 3, we can assume that F_i is type 1 or 2 for each $0 \leq i \leq q$. We prove Claim 5 now.

Claim 5. *F_i is a downward (fuzzy) path for all $0 \leq i \leq q$.*

Proof. The proof of Claim 1 also showed that the last vertex of F_0 is in L_0. Since by Claim 2, each F_0 is either a downward or an upward path, F_0 is a downward path.

We show now that the rest of the F_i are also downward. Suppose for contradiction that there is an upward path among $F_0, \ldots, F_q$, and let j be the smallest index such that F_j is an upward path. Let β be the index such that F_j contains a separated arc in $\mathcal{L}_{\beta+1}$, but not in $\mathcal{L}_\beta$.

Subclaim 1. *β exists.*

Proof. It is sufficient to show that F_j does not contain a separated arc in $\mathcal{L}_0$. Suppose otherwise. If $\ell(c_j) \geq 2$, then F_j cannot be an upward fuzzy path. If $\ell(c_j) = 0$, then the first arc of F_j is non-separated, so all arcs of F_j in $\mathcal{L}_0$ are non-separated by Claim 4. If $\ell(c_j) = 1$ then the first arc of F_j must be a backward arc, since otherwise F_j could not be an upward path containing an arc in $\mathcal{L}_0$. If this first arc f is non-separated then we use Claim 4 as above. If f is separated, then F_j is type 3, and that leads to a contradiction by Claim 3. □

Subclaim 2. *There is an index $j' < j$ such that $F_{j'}$ contains a separated arc $g_{j'}$ in $\mathcal{L}_\beta$.*

Proof. By Claim 4, if the upward fuzzy path F_j does not contain a separated arc in $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ and it contains a separated arc in $\mathcal{L}_{\beta+1}$, then all arcs of F_j must be in arc levels $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \geq \beta$. Therefore when F_j is chosen, by the definition of the sequence $F_0, \ldots, F_q$, there must be an index $j' < j$ such that $F_{j'}$ contains a separated arc in $\mathcal{L}_\beta$. where. □

Since $j' < j$, $F_{j'}$ is a downward path.

Subclaim 3. *Let f be a separated arc of F_i for some $0 \leq i \leq q$. Then for each $0 \leq \alpha \leq \ell(f)$, there is an index $i' \leq i$ such that $F_{i'}$ contains a separated arc in $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$.*

Proof. This easily follows from the definition of $F_0, \ldots, F_q$ and Claim 4. □

Subclaim 4. *Let f be the first arc of $F_{j'}$. Then there exists an i such that F_j contains a separated arc in $\mathcal{L}_i$, where $i > \ell(f)$ if f is separated, and $i \geq \ell(f)$ otherwise.*

Proof. Assume first f is separated. Using Subclaim 3, for each $\alpha \leq \ell(f)$, there is an index k such that F_k contains a separated arc in $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$. Therefore when F_j is defined, it must contain a separated arc in an arc level $\mathcal{L}_i$, where $i > \ell(f)$. If f is non-separated, then since $F_{j'}$ is downward, $F_{j'}$ contains a separated arc in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(f)-1}$. Now we can proceed as in the previous case. □

Subclaim 5. *If both F_j and $F_{j'}$ are type* 1*, then T contains a fuzzy* N*.*

Proof. Since the first arc of F_j and $F_{j'}$ are non-separated and both F_j and $F_{j'}$ contain a separated arc by assumption, both F_j and $F_{j'}$ must have height at least 2. Let b_1 be the first vertex of $F_{j'}$ in L_β, t_1 be a vertex of $F_{j'}$ in the top level of $F_{j'}$. Let b_2 be a vertex of F_j in level L_β (which exists since F_j is type 1), and t_2 be a vertex of $F_{j'}$ in $L_{\ell(t_1)}$ (which exists by Subclaim 4). Since both F_j and $F_{j'}$ are type 1 and S is a fuzzy path, any vertex of $S(t_1, b_2)$ is in level L_k for some $\beta \leq k \leq \ell(t_1)$. It follows that b_1, t_1, b_2, t_2 satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.4, and therefore T contains a fuzzy N. □

Subclaim 6. *If F_j and $F_{j'}$ are type* 2*, then T contains a fuzzy* N*.*

Proof. The proof is illustrated in Figure 2. Let b_1 be the first vertex of $F_{j'}$ in L_β. Since $F_{j'}$ is type 2, $c_{j'}$ cannot have inneighbours in S. Let t_1 be the outneighbours of $c_{j'}$ that is a vertex of $S(c_{j'}, c_j)$. Since $F_{j'}$ is type 2, c_j does not have outneighbours in S. Let b_2 be the inneighbour of c_j in $S(c_{j'}, c_j)$. Let t_2 be a vertex of F_j in $L_{\ell(t_1)}$. Using Subclaim 4, it is easy to check that b_1, t_1, b_2, t_2 satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.4, and therefore T contains a fuzzy N. □

The cases when one of F_j and $F_{j'}$ is type 1 and the other is type 2 can be handled similarly to the previous two claims. □

By Claim 5, F_q is a downward path. By definition, F_q contains a separated arc a_q in $\mathcal{L}_{height(T)-1}$. If the path $F_q(c_q, a_q)$ has height at least 2, then it cannot be downward since F_q is fuzzy. If $F(c_q, a_q)$ has height 1, then since a_q is separated, all arcs of $F(c_q, a_q)$ must be separated, including the first arc e of $F_q(c_q, a_q)$. Note that e must be a forward arc, since if it is a backward arc, then $c_q \in L_n$, and S must contain an inneighbour of c_q, implying that e cannot be separated. It follows that $F(c_q, a_q)$ is type 3, and the contradiction follows from Claim 3. The lemma is proved. □

Before we can proceed, we need a simple characterization of oriented trees of height 1 containing no Z_6 as an induced subgraph.

Definition 3.6. *An* in-star *(*out-star*) is an oriented tree with vertex set $\{v_0, v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$, and arc set $\{v_1v_0, v_2v_0, \ldots, v_nv_0\}$ ($\{v_0v_1, v_0v_2, \ldots, v_0v_n\}$), where $n \geq 0$. Note that if $n = 0$, then the star is just vertex v_0. Vertex v_0 is called the* root*, and vertices v_i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) are called* leaves*.*

Let S_0 be an in-star (out-star) with leaves $v_1, \ldots, v_n$, and $S_1, \ldots, S_n$ be out-stars (in-stars) with root vertices $r_1, \ldots, r_n$, respectively. Let S be the oriented tree obtained by

- *taking the disjoint union of S_i, $0 \leq i \leq n$, and*



Figure 2: Illustration of the proof of Subclaim 6.

- *identifying the leaf vertex v_j of S_0 with the root vertex r_j of S_j, for each $1 \leq j \leq n$.*

Then S is called an in-spider (out-spider)*. S_0 is called the* body*, and $S_1, \ldots, S_n$ are called the* legs *of S.*

Lemma 3.7. *Let T be an oriented tree of height* 1*. Suppose that T does not contain* Z_6 *as an induced subgraph. Then T is either an in-spider or an out-spider.*

Proof. Let L_0 and L_1 be the vertex of levels of T. Assume first that T contains an induced $Z_5^{f=0}$ with vertex set $V = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ and arc set $\{ab, cb, cd, ed\}$. Then $a, c, e \in L_0$ and $b, d \in L_1$. Assume that $L_1 = \{u_1, \ldots, u_n\}$. If cu_i is not an arc for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, then since T is connected, there must be an induced oriented path from u_i to a vertex of in V. For example, if there is a path from u_i to e, then there is an arc ew in T, and thus $\{a, b, c, d, e, w\}$ induces a Z_6 in T. It is easy to check that T contains an induced Z_6 in the remaining cases.

Let S_0 to be the out-star with root c and leaf set L_1. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, let S_i be the in-star with root u_i. Let the leaves of S_i be the inneighbours of u_i. Clearly, T is an out-spider with body S_0 and legs $S_1, \ldots, S_n$. If T contains a $\mathrm{Z}_5^{f=1}$, then an analogous argument shows that T is an in-spider.

Suppose now that T contains an induced $\mathrm{Z}_4^{f=0}$ with vertex set $\{a, b, c, d\}$ and arc set $\{ab, cb, cd\}$ but not a Z_5. Then a has out-degree 1 and d has in-degree 1, since otherwise T would contain a Z_5. Any vertex w of T in L_1 can have only c as its inneighbour, and any vertex z in L_0 can have only b as its outneighbours. It follows that T is both an in-spider and an out-spider.

The remaining cases are also easy to analyze, e.g., when T contains a Z_3 but not Z_4, then T is up-star or a down-star. □

We are ready to prove one direction of Theorem 3.2 after the following definition, which will also be used later.

Definition 3.8. *Let G be a leveled digraph and v be a vertex of G. The* up-component of G at v *is the subgraph of G induced by the set of vertices*

$$U = \{u \mid \exists \text{ a walk } W \text{ from } v \text{ to } u \text{ such that for each vertex } w \text{ of } W,\ \ell(w) \geq \ell(v)\}.$$

Given a vertex level L of G, the set of up-components of G at level L *is the set of digraphs which are up-components for some vertex $v \in L$. A* down-component at v *and* set of down-components at level L *are defined analogously.*

Lemma 3.9. *If an oriented tree T contains neither a* Z_6 *nor a fuzzy* N *as an induced subgraph, then T is constructible.*

Proof. Let T be as stated in the lemma. We use Lemma 3.5 to find an integer α such that arc level $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ of T contains exactly one component R. (If there is no such α, then T must be a single vertex, and we are done.) By Lemma 3.7, R is an out-spider or an in-spider. We assume that R is an in-spider. The case when R is an out-spider can be handled similarly. Assume that S_0 is the body of R having root v_0, and leaves $v_1, \ldots, v_n$. We define T_0 as the up-component of T at v_0 (so v_0 is in the bottom vertex level of T_0), and $T_1, \ldots, T_{n'}$ as the components of $T \setminus T_0$. We show that T is the up-join of $T_0, T_1, \ldots, T_{n'}$; this will follow from these claims:

1. The only common vertex of T_0 and R is v_0, and the only vertex of T_0 in $L_{\ell(v_0)}$ that has indegree non-zero (with respect to T) is v_0;

2. Each T_i contains precisely one vertex among $v_1, \ldots, v_n$. (And by definition, no $T_{i'}$ and $T_{i''}$, $i' \neq i''$ contains the same vertex among $v_1, \ldots, v_n$.) We assume w.l.o.g. that v_i belongs to T_i. It also follows that $n = n'$. Furthermore, any vertex $w \neq v_i$ of T_i in $L_{\ell(v_0)-1}$ has out-degree zero.

Once these are established, it follows that T is the up-join of $T_1, \ldots, T_{n'}$. Vertex v_0 is in the bottom vertex level of the tree T_0. Each T_i contains at most one vertex of degree at least one in $L_{\ell(v_0)-1}$, which is v_i, and T is obtained by taking the disjoint union $T_0, T_1, \ldots, T_{n'}$ and adding the arcs of $v_1v_0, \ldots, v_nv_0$. We prove the two claims now.

Suppose for contradiction that T_0 contains a vertex w of R such that $w \neq v_0$. Then w is an outneighbours or v_j for some $1 \leq j \leq n$ (because R is an in-spider). Therefore the arcs v_jw, v_jv_0, and the path from v_0 to w in T_0 forms a cycle in T, a contradiction. It follows that any vertex $w' \neq v_0$ of T_0 in $L_{\ell(v_0)}$ has indegree 0 in T, since otherwise $\mathcal{L}_i$ would contain at least two components (contradicting our choice of i).

We prove the second claim. Since T is connected, there must be a path from v_0 to a vertex of T_i. This can only happen if T_i contains at least one of the vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_n$. Conversely, suppose for contradiction that there are indices $1 \leq i', i'' \leq n$ such that $v_{i'}$ and $v_{i''}$ belong to the same T_i for some $1 \leq i \leq n'$. But then the arcs $v_{i'}v_0$, $v_{i''}v_0$ together with the oriented path in T_i from $v_{i'}$ to $v_{i''}$ would form a cycle, contradicting that T is an oriented tree.

Furthermore, assume for contradiction that there is a vertex $w \neq v_i$ of T_i (for some $1 \leq i \leq n'$) in $L_{\ell(v_0)-1}$ that has out-degree at least one. Then the arc leaving w is an arc in $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ that is not part of R, a contradiction. □

Proof of Theorem 3.2. One direction of the theorem follows from Lemma 3.9. The other direction either follows from the chain of implications outlined at the end of the introduction, or a direct proof is given in Appendix B, see Lemma 10.1. □

4 A simple inductive algorithm for LHOM(T)

We note that if an oriented tree T contains a Z_6 or a fuzzy N as an induced subgraph, then LHOM(T) is NL-hard. This follows from the fact if T contains a Z_6 or a fuzzy N as an induced

subgraph, then T contains a circular N, as we will show in Theorem 5.1. If T contains a circular N then LHOM(T) is NL-hard by [4].[6]

In the rest of this section, we inductively construct a logspace algorithm for LHOM(T). We begin with a high-level description given as Algorithm 1 below. Suppose that T is the up-join of $T_0, T_1, \ldots, T_n$, v_0 is the central vertex, and $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ are the join vertices. (The case when T is the down-join of some trees can be analyzed similarly.) We assume inductively that there is a logspace algorithm A_i for LHOM(T_i) for each $0 \leq i \leq n$.

Algorithm 1 High-level algorithm when T is the up-join of $T_0, T_1, \ldots, T_n$.

Input: A digraph G. (G could have many components.)
Output: YES if there is a list homomorphism from G to T, and NO otherwise.

1: **for** each component G' of G **do**
2: Check whether G' is leveled. If not, output NO.
3: If the height of G' is larger than the height of T, output NO.
4: Find the height h of G', and find the vertex levels $L_0, L_1, \ldots, L_h$ of G'.
5: **for** each $0 \leq \alpha \leq h-1$ **do**
6: **if** there is a list homomorphism h from G' to T such that h maps level L_α of G' to level $L_{\ell(v_0)-1}$ of T **then** mark G' as GOOD
7: **end if**
8: **end for**
9: **if** there is a list homomorphism from G' to T_i for some $0 \leq i \leq n$ **then** mark G' as GOOD
10: **end if**
11: **end for**
12: **if** all components G' of G are marked GOOD **then** output YES.
13: **else** output NO.
14: **end if**

First we argue the correctness of Algorithm 1, and then show how to implement line 6.

Lemma 4.1. *Let T be the up-join of T_i, and A_i be the corresponding logspace algorithms for LHOM(T_i), $0 \leq i \leq n$, as described above. Let G be a digraph. Then there is a list homomorphism from G to T if and only if Algorithm 1 on input G outputs YES.*

Proof. Clearly, if Algorithm 1 outputs YES, then there is a list homomorphism from G to H. Suppose therefore that Algorithm 1 outputs NO. If Algorithm 1 outputs NO in line 2 or line 3, then clearly, there can be no homomorphism from G to T. Assume therefore that Algorithm 1 outputs NO in line 13. Then at least one of the components G' of G is *not* marked as GOOD. Assume for contradiction that there is a list homomorphism h from G' to T. Then either there is a vertex level of G' that is mapped to $L^T_{\ell(v_0)-1}$, or not. There cannot be a vertex level of G' that is mapped to $L^T_{\ell(v_0)-1}$, since then in line 6 the algorithm would have marked G' as good. Therefore h must map G' to T in such a way that no vertex of G' is mapped to a vertex in $L^T_{\ell(v_0)-1}$. That means that h does not map any arc of G' to any of the arcs $v_1v_0, v_2v_0, \ldots, v_nv_0$. Since G' is connected,

[6]However, it is not hard to directly prove that if an oriented tree T contains a Z_6 or a fuzzy fuzzy N as an induced subgraph, then LHOM(T) is NL-hard. Note that we can *primitive-positive define* (*pp-define*) the relation $R = \{(0,0),(0,1),(1,1)\}$ over a Z_6 or a fuzzy N. For example, the pp-definition of R over Z_6 can be done in the same way as it is done for an undirected path on 6 vertices in [5]. The pp-definition of R over a fuzzy N can be done very similarly to the definition of R using a circular N (see [4]). If R can be pp-defined over H, then it is well known that there is a straightforward logspace reduction from the NL-complete directed graph unreachability problem to LHOM(H).

this implies that h must map G' to T_i for some $0 \leq i \leq n$. But that also cannot happen because then G' would be marked GOOD in line 9, a contradiction. □

To implement Algorithm 1 in logspace, we need the following lemmas about digraphs.

Lemma 4.2. *Let G be a connected acyclic digraph G. Fix two arbitrary vertices $u, v \in V(G)$. If G is not leveled, then there are two different walks W_1 and W_2, both from u to v, such that $net(W_1) \neq net(W_2)$*

Proof. Suppose that every walk from u to v has the same net length. For each vertex w of G, let Q_w be an arbitrary walk from u to w. Let Q'_w be another arbitrary walk from u to w (it could be the same as Q_w). If $net(Q_w) \neq net(Q'_w)$, then let W be a walk from w to v. Then both Q_wW and Q'_wW are walks from u to v, and $net(Q_wW) \neq net(Q'_wW)$, a contradiction. Therefore $net(Q_w) = net(Q'_w)$.

Assign each vertex w the integer $net(Q_w)$. Let xy an arbitrary arc of G, then $net(Q_y) = net(Q_xxy)$, where Q_xxy denotes the walk Q_x and then making one more step from the last vertex x of Q_x to vertex y. Therefore $net(Q_y) = net(Q_x) + 1$, i.e., if xy is an arc, then the integer assigned to y is one larger than the integer assigned to x. Let m be the minimum of $net(Q_w)$ over $w \in V(G)$. Note that $m \leq 0$ since $net(Q_w) = 0$. Assign each vertex w to level $L_{net(Q_w)-m}$. It follows that G is leveled. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let G be a connected acyclic digraph G. Then G is leveled if and only if every walk in G has bounded net length.*

Proof. If G is leveled then every oriented walk from a vertex u to a vertex v of G has net length $\ell(v) - \ell(u)$, and therefore every walk in G has bounded net length. Conversely, suppose that G is not leveled, and fix two vertices u and v of G. By Lemma 4.2 there are two different walks W_1 and W_2 from u to v such that $net(W_1) \neq net(W_2)$. Assume without loss of generality that $net(W_1) > net(W_2)$. Then for any positive integer k, $net((W_1\bar{W}_2)^{k+1}) > k$. □

Definition 4.4. *Given a digraph G and an integer d, the* undirected *graph $\mathcal{G}(G, d)$ is constructed as follows. (For short, we write $\mathcal{G}$ for $\mathcal{G}(G, d)$.)*

- *The vertex set of $\mathcal{G}$ is defined as $V(\mathcal{G}) = \{I_j(v) \mid v \in V(G)$ and $v \in V(G)$, and $0 \leq j \leq d\}$*
- *The edge set of $\mathcal{G}$ is defined as $E(\mathcal{G}) = \{(I_j(u), I_{j+1}(v)) \mid uv$ is a forward arc of G, and $0 \leq j \leq d-1\}$*

We use I_k to denote $\bigcup_{v \in V(G)} I_k(v)$, and $I_k^{\mathcal{G}}$ to emphasize that I_k is defined with respect to $\mathcal{G}$.

Clearly, there is a logspace algorithm that takes G and d as inputs and outputs $\mathcal{G}(G, d)$. The following lemma is a simple observation.

Lemma 4.5. *Let G be a digraph, and consider $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(G, d)$. There is a walk from a vertex $I_0(u) \in I_0^{\mathcal{G}}$ to a vertex $I_k(v) \in I_k^{\mathcal{G}}$ if and only if there is a walk $W = a_0 \dots a_n$ in G such that $a_0 = u$ and $a_n = v$ such that $net(W) = k$, and for each $0 \leq i \leq n$, $\ell(a_i) \geq \ell(a_0)$ (i.e., a_0 is in the bottom level of W).*

Lemma 4.6. *Let G be a connected digraph, and $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(G, d+1)$. Then G is leveled and has height at most d if and only if for each vertex $I_0(u) \in I_0^{\mathcal{G}}$ and $I_{d+1}(v) \in I_{d+1}^{\mathcal{G}}$ there is no walk from $I_0(u)$ to $I_{d+1}(v)$ in $\mathcal{G}(G, d+1)$.*

Proof. Assume that G is leveled and has height at most d. Suppose for contradiction that for some vertices $I_0(u) \in I_0^{\mathcal{G}}$ and $I_{d+1}(v) \in I_{d+1}^{\mathcal{G}}$ there is a walk $I_0(a_0) \dots I_{d+1}(a_n)$ in $\mathcal{G}(G, d+1)$. Then the walk $a_0 \dots a_n$ has net length $d+1$, so G cannot have height at most d.

Conversely, assume that G is not leveled or has height at least $d+1$. In both cases (in the former case using Lemma 4.3), there is a walk $W = a_0 \dots a_n$ in G such that $a_0 = u$ and $a_n = v$ such that $net(W) = d+1$, and for each $0 \leq i \leq n$, $\ell(a_i) \geq \ell(a_0)$ (i.e., a_0 is in the bottom level of W). Therefore by Lemma 4.5, there is a walk from $I_0(u)$ to $I_{d+1}(v)$ in $\mathcal{G}(G, d+1)$. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let G be a leveled digraph of height at most h (a constant), and $v \in V(G)$. Then there is a logspace algorithm that outputs the up-component (down-component) of G at v.*

Proof. We produce $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(G, h)$. We output every vertex u such that there is an undirected path (using Reingold's algorithm [13]) from $I_0(v)$ to $I_j(u)$ in $\mathcal{G}$ for some j. These vertices form U. Now we output every arc ab such that $a, b \in U$. The down-component at v can be produced in a similar way. □

We are ready to specify the main subroutine (Algorithm 2) of Algorithm 1. We denote the disjoint union of the trees $T_1, \dots, T_n$ with T'. Inductively, we assume that there is a logspace algorithm A_i for each of LHOM(T_i), $0 \leq i \leq n$. We can easily combine the algorithms for LHOM(T_i), $1 \leq i \leq n$, to obtain a logspace algorithm A' for LHOM(T') (we use Reingold's logspace algorithm for undirected reachability [13] to output the components G' of G, and then test whether there is a list homomorphism from each G' to one of the T_i-s.)

Algorithm 2 Check if there is a list homomorphism $h : G \to T$ such that $h(L_\alpha^G) \subseteq L_{\ell(v_0)-1}^T$.

Input: A leveled digraph G, and an integer $0 \leq \alpha \leq height(G) - 1$.

Output: YES if there is a list homomorphism $h : G \to T$ such that $h(L_\alpha^G) \subseteq L_{\ell(v_0)-1}^T$ and NO otherwise.

1: Let $\mathcal{U}_{all}$ be the set of up-components of G at level $L_{\alpha+1}^G$.

2: Using A_0, check for each $U \in \mathcal{U}$ if there is a list homomorphism h from U to T_0 such that for each $v \in V(U) \cap L_{\alpha+1}^G$ that has at least one inneighbour when considered as a vertex of G, $h(v) = v_0$ (this can be enforced by setting the list of v to $\{v_0\}$). Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the set of those $U \in \mathcal{U}_{all}$ for which such a list homomorphism exists.

3: Let G' be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices $V(G) \setminus V(\mathcal{U})$, where a vertex v belongs to $V(\mathcal{U})$ if it is a vertex of some up-component in $\mathcal{U}$.

4: Using A', check if there is a list homomorphism h from G' to T' such that vertices of G' in level L_α^G are mapped to vertices of T' in $L_{\ell(v_0)-1}^T$. If no such list homomorphism exists, output NO.

5: Otherwise output YES.

The following lemma proves the correctness of Algorithm 2.

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose that T is the up-join of $T_0, T_1, \dots, T_n$, v_0 is the central vertex of T_0, and v_i is the join vertex of T_i, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let G be a leveled digraph, and $0 \leq \alpha \leq height(G) - 1$ be an integer. Then there is a list homomorphism $h : G \to T$ such that level L_α of G is mapped to level $L_{\ell(v_0)-1}$ of T, (i.e., $h(L_\alpha^G) \subseteq L_{\ell(v_0)-1}^T$) if and only if Algorithm 2 outputs YES on input G, α.*

Proof. Assume that Algorithm 2 outputs YES. (The proof is aided by Figure 3.) Then there is a list homomorphism h' from G' to T', and a list homomorphism h_U from each up-component $U \in \mathcal{U}$ to T_0. Since all arcs $v_1v_0, v_2v_0, \dots, v_nv_0$ are present, the map that $h(v)$ defined as $h'(v)$ if $v \in V(G')$, and as $h_U(v)$ if $v \in V(U)$ is a list homomorphism from G to T.

Conversely, assume that there is a list homomorphism g from G to T. If there is a list homomorphism from an up-component U to T_0, then we can assume that g maps U to T_0. After these up-components are removed from G to obtain G', $g|_{G'}$ is a list homomorphism from G' to T'. Therefore the algorithm accepts.



Figure 3: Illustration of the correctness proof of Algorithm 2.

□

It is routine to implement Algorithms 1 and 2 so that they use only logarithmic space. This is done using the basic trick that if A_1 and A_2 are logspace algorithms, and A_3 is the algorithm that first runs A_1 on the input, then feeds the output of A_1 to A_2, and then outputs the output of A_2, then A_3 can be assumed to be a logspace algorithm. The various reachability tests the algorithms use can be implemented using Reingold's logspace algorithm for undirected reachability [13].

5 Circular N, Z_6, and fuzzy N

We prove that if H is a digraph, then H contains a fuzzy N or Z_6 as an induced subgraph if and only if H contains a circular N. Note that assuming that $L \neq NL$, there is a simpler proof using already proved results.[7] However, we wish to prove this without the assumption that $L \neq NL$, as stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *An oriented tree T contains a Z_6 or a fuzzy* N *as induced subgraphs if and only if T contains a circular* N*.*

We begin with recalling some definitions from [4]. Let H be a digraph. We define two walks $X = x_0x_1 \dots x_n$ and $Y = y_0y_1 \dots y_n$ in H to be *congruent* if they follow the same pattern of forward and backward arcs, i.e., x_ix_{i+1} is a forward arc if and only if y_iy_{i+1} is a forward arc. Suppose X, Y and $Z = z_0z_1 \dots z_n$ are congruent walks. We say that x_iy_{i+1} is a *faithful arc from X to Y* if it is an arc of H in the same direction (forward or backward) as x_ix_{i+1}. We say that X *avoids* Y in H if there is no faithful arc from X to Y in H. Observe that two walks of length zero also avoid each other.

[7] Assume for contradiction that T contains a circular circular N but no Z_6 or fuzzy N as an induced subgraph. If T contains no Z_6 or fuzzy N, then we have a logspace algorithm for LHOM(T) by the previous results of this paper. Since T contains a circular N, LHOM(H) is NL-hard ([4]), so our logspace algorithm works for an NL-hard problem, and therefore $NL = L$, a contradiction.

We say that Z *protects* Y from X if the existence of faithful arcs x_iz_{i+1} and z_jy_{j+1} in H implies that $j \leq i$. In other words, Z protects Y from X if and only if there exists a subscript s such that $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_s$ avoids $z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_s$ and $z_{s+1}, z_{s+1}, \ldots, z_n$ avoids $y_{s+1}, y_{s+2}, \ldots, y_n$.

Definition 5.2. *Let x, x', y, y' be vertices of a digraph H. An* extended N *from x, x' to y, y' in H consists of congruent walks X (from x to x'), Y (from y to y'), and Z (from y to x'), such that X avoids Y and Z protects Y from X. A* circular N *is an extended N in which $x = x'$ and $y = y'$.*

Lemma 5.3. *If an oriented tree T contains a* Z_6 *or a fuzzy* N *as induced subgraphs, then T contains a circular* N*.*

Proof. We first show how to define X,Y and Z when G is an induced a Z_6 with vertex set $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and arcs $\{01, 21, 23, 43, 45\}$. Set $X = 01010$, $Y = 45454$, and $Z = 43210$. It is trivial to check that X avoids Y and Z protects Y from X.

Assume that the induced subgraph H is a fuzzy N that can be expressed as $P_1T\bar{P}_2DP_3$. Suppose that the first vertices of P_1 and P_3 are x_0 and y_0, respectively, and the last vertices of P_1 and P_3 are x'_0 and y'_0, respectively. Let $h = height(P_1)$.

We define an oriented path Q as follows. Let $Q' = Q'_1Q'_2 \ldots Q'_h$, where each Q'_i is a $Z_4^{f=0}$. Then Q is define as $Q = Q'\bar{Q}'$. Let q denote the first and q^* denote the last vertex of Q. Notice that because P_1, P_2 and P_3 are minimal fuzzy paths and T and B are $Z_3^{f=1}$ and $Z_3^{f=0}$, there exist three homomorphisms h_1, h_2 and h_3 as follows.

- h_1 maps Q to P_1 such that $h_1(q) = h_1(q^*) = x_0$.
- h_3 maps Q to P_3 such that $h_3(q) = h_3(q^*) = y_0$.
- Recall that $Q = Q'\bar{Q}'$. Homomorphism h_2 maps Q' to P_2 and $\bar{Q}'$ to $\bar{P}_1$ such that $h_2(q) = y_0$ and $h_2(q^*) = x_0$.

Suppose that $Q = q_0q_1 \ldots q_n$, and set $X = h_1(q_0) \ldots h_1(q_n)$, $Y = h_3(q_0) \ldots h_3(q_n)$, and $Z = h_2(q_0) \ldots h_2(q_n)$. Since X contains only vertices of P_1 and Y contains only vertices of P_3, there is no arc a vertex of X and a vertex of Y, and therefore X avoids Y. It is also straightforward to verify that Z protects Y from X. □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. One direction of the theorem follows from Lemma 5.3. The other direction either follows from the chain of implications outlined at the end of the introduction, or a direct proof is given in Appendix B, see Lemma 10.3. □

6 An algebraic characterization

In this section, we prove that an oriented tree that does not contain a Z_6 or a fuzzy N as an induced subgraph admits a chain of Hagemann-Mitschke polymorphisms of length 3 (Theorem 6.1). It is quite easy to see that this is not the case for general digraphs. For the sake of completeness, we give an explicit digraph that enjoys a Hagemann-Mitschke chain of conservative polymorphisms of length n but not length $n - 1$. This is the content of Theorem 6.4.

6.1 Hagemann-Mitschke chain

Theorem 6.1. *Let T be an oriented tree. Then T has conservative polymorphisms f_1, f_2 and f_3 that form a HM-chain if and only if T does not contain a* Z_6 *or a fuzzy* N *as an induced subgraph.*

The following lemma proves one direction of the theorem. (The basic idea of the proof of this lemma is inspired by the proof of Lemma 18 in [5].)

Lemma 6.2. *Let T be an oriented tree. If T can be constructed using Definition 3.1, then T has conservative polymorphisms f_1, f_2 and f_3 that form a HM-chain.*

Proof. We show the existence of the claimed conservative polymorphisms using induction on the construction of T given in Definition 3.1. The defined operations will be trivially conservative, and we won't mentioned this explicitly. We will work with the up-join operation, and note that the proof works similarly for the down-join operation.

We begin with breaking down the construction in Definition 3.1 into two steps. Assume that T is the up-join of $T_0, T_1, \dots, T_n$ with central vertex v_0 and join vertices $v_1, \dots, v_n$. Taking the up-join can be thought of as taking the disjoint union $T' = T_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup T_n$ of $T_1, \dots, T_n$, and then taking the disjoint union $T' \sqcup T_0$ and adding the arcs $v_i v_0$, $1 \leq i \leq n$.

First we show that if each of $T_1, \dots, T_n$ admits a HM-chain of polymorphisms of length 3, then so does $T_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup T_n$. Let f_1^i, f_2^i, f_3^i be the desired polymorphisms for T_i, $1 \leq i \leq n$. If $(x, y, z) \in V(T_j)^3$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$, then for each $1 \leq s \leq 3$, let $g_s(x, y, z) = f_s^j(x, y, z)$. If $(x, y, z) \in V(T_k) \times V(T_l) \times V(T_m)$ such that $|\{k, l, m\}| > 1$, then let $g_1(x, y, z) = x$ and $g_3(x, y, z) = z$, and furthermore, $g_2(x, y, z) = z$ if $k = l$ and $g_2(x, y, z) = x$ otherwise. It is easy to check that g_1, g_2, g_3 form a HM-chain, and that each g_s is a conservative polymorphism of T'.

Suppose now that f_1, f_2, f_3 and g_1, g_2, g_3 are the desired polymorphisms for T_0 and $T' = T_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup T_n$, respectively, and that T is obtained by adding arcs $v_1 v_0, \dots, v_n v_0$ to $T_0 \sqcup T'$. Let $m = height(T)$. We argue first that it is sufficient to define polymorphisms for vertices x, y, z that are all in the same vertex level L_j^T, where $0 \leq j \leq m$. For suppose that $F_1', F_2', F_3' : L_0^3 \cup \cdots \cup L_m^3 \to T$ are operations that are edge-preserving, conservative, and satisfy all required identities. Then we can extend these to full operations with the same properties:

$$F_1(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} F_1'(x, y, z) & \text{if } x, y, z \in L_j^T \text{ for some } 0 \leq j \leq m, \\ x & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$F_3(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} F_3'(x, y, z) & \text{if } x, y, z \in L_j^T \text{ for some } 0 \leq j \leq m, \\ z & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$F_2(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} F_2'(x, y, z) & \text{if } x, y, z \in L_j^T \text{ for some } 0 \leq j \leq m, \text{ else} \\ z & \text{if } x, y \in L_j^T \text{ for some } 0 \leq j \leq m, \\ x & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The claimed properties are easy to check. To see that the defined operations are arc-preserving, note that if xx',yy' and zz' are arcs and x, y, z are in levels $L_{i(x)}, L_{i(y)}, L_{i(z)}$, respectively, then x', y', z' are in levels $L_{i(x)+1}, L_{i(y)+1}, L_{i(z)+1}$, respectively, so the same case in the above definition applies for both (x, y, z) and (x', y', z').

Assume therefore that T is obtained by adding arcs $v_i v_0$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ to $T_0 \sqcup T'$. Using the induction hypothesis and the above argument for disjoint union, we can assume that T_0 admits the desired operations f_1, f_2, f_3, and T' admits the desired operations g_1, g_2, g_3. First we define F_1 and F_3 for T as follows.

$$F_1(x,y,z) = \begin{cases} f_1(x,y,z) & \text{if } x,y,z \in V(T_0), \text{ else} \\ g_1(x,y,z) & \text{if } x,y,z \in V(T'), \text{ else} \\ x & \text{if } x \in V(T_0) \text{ or } y,z \in V(T_0), \text{ else} \\ u & \text{where } u \text{ is leftmost of } \{y,z\} \cap V(T_0). \end{cases}$$

$$F_3(x,y,z) = \begin{cases} f_3(x,y,z) & \text{if } x,y,z \in V(T_0), \text{ else} \\ g_3(x,y,z) & \text{if } x,y,z \in V(T'), \text{ else} \\ z & \text{if } z \in V(T_0) \text{ or } x,y \in V(T_0), \text{ else} \\ u & \text{where } u \text{ is leftmost of } \{x,y\} \cap V(T_0). \end{cases}$$

Notice that F_1 is well defined, since if the first three cases do not apply, then in the last case, (precisely) one of y and z is in $V(T_0)$. We can argue similarly for F_3.

Observe that $F_1(x,y,y) = x$. In the first two cases, this follows from the induction hypothesis. Otherwise, the third line of the definition sets the value of $F_1(x,y,y)$ to x. (The last case cannot occur.) Similarly, we can check that $F_3(x,x,y) = y$.

We verify that F_1 is arc-preserving, and note that F_3 can be analyzed similarly. Assume that xx', yy', and zz' are arcs of T.

- If $\ell(x) < \ell(v_0) - 1$ or $\ell(x) > \ell(v_0) - 1$, then we observe that for each $w \in \{x,y,z\}$, it holds that $w \in V(T_0) \Leftrightarrow w' \in V(T_0)$. Also recall that $V(T_0)$ and $V(T')$ partition $V(T)$. Therefore the same case of the above definition applies for both $F_1(x,y,z)$ and $F_1(x',y',z')$. It follows from this and the induction hypothesis that $F_1(x,y,z)F_1(x',y',z')$ is an arc of T.

- Assume therefore that $\ell(x) = \ell(v_0)-1$. If $x',y',z' \in V(T')$, then again, $x,x',y,y',z,z' \in V(T')$ and we are done. We note that if any of x',y',z' is a vertex in $V(T_0)$, that vertex must be v_0, since v_0 is the only vertex of T_0 in $L^T_{\ell(v_0)}$ that has an inneighbour in T. We also note that if $F_1(x',y',z') = v_0$, then since $F_1(x,y,z) \in \{v_1,\ldots,v_n\}$ and v_iv_0 are arcs for all $1 \le i \le n$, we are done.

  If $x',y',z' \in V(T_0)$, then $x' = y' = z' = v_0$, so $F_1(x',y',z') = v_0$. If $x' \in V(T_0)$, then line 3 of the definition gives that $F_1(x',y',z') = v_0$.

  Assume therefore that $x' \in V(T')$ and $y',z' \in V(T_0)$. Then we have by definition that $F_1(x',y',z') = x'$. If we show that $F_1(x,y,z) = x$, then since xx' is an arc, we are done. Recall that $x,y,z \in \{v_1,\ldots,v_n\}$, so $x,y,z \in V(T')$, and thus $F_1(x,y,z) = g_1(x,y,z)$. By the definition of g_1 above (recall that g_1 is over the disjoint union $T' = T_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup T_n$), if not all of x,y,z are in the same component of T', then $g_1(x,y,z) = x$. Therefore $F_1(x,y,z) = x$. So we can assume that x,y,z are all in the same component T_i of T', for some $1 \le i \le n$. Then since the only arc from T_i to v_0 is v_iv_0 and $y' = z' = v_0$, we have that $y = z = v_i$. By the induction hypothesis $g_1(x,y,y) = x$, so $F_1(x,y,z) = x$.

  If $y' \in V(T_0)$ and $z' \in V(T')$, or if $y' \in V(T')$ and $z' \in V(T_0)$, then line 4 of the definition sets $F_1(x',y',z') = v_0$.

We define

$$F_2(x,y,z) = \begin{cases} F_1(x,x,z) & \text{if } x \in V(T') \text{ and } y,z \in V(T_0), \text{ or if } x \in V(T_0) \text{ and } y,z \in V(T'), \text{ else} \\ F_3(x,z,z) & \text{if } x,y \in V(T_0) \text{ and } z \in V(T'), \text{ or if } x,y \in V(T') \text{ and } z \in V(T_0), \text{ else} \\ f_2(x,y,z) & \text{if } x,y,z \in V(T_0), \text{ else} \\ g_2(x,y,z) & \text{if } x,y,z \in V(T'), \text{ else} \\ w, & \text{where } w \text{ is leftmost of } \{x,y,z\} \cap V(T_0). \end{cases}$$

Note that F_2 is well defined. In particular, in line 5, at least one of x, y, z must be in $V(T_0)$, since otherwise line 4 applies.

To complete the proof that F_1, F_2, and F_3 form a HM-chain, we show that $F_1(x,x,z) = F_2(x,z,z)$ and $F_2(x,x,z) = F_3(x,z,z)$. We focus on $F_1(x,x,z) = F_2(x,z,z)$, and note that it can be shown similarly that $F_2(x,x,z) = F_3(x,z,z)$. If line 1 of the definition of F_2 applies, then we are done by definition. Note that line 2 cannot not apply for $F_2(x,z,z)$. If line 3 applies, then $x = z = v_0$, so $F_2(x,z,z) = v_0 = F_1(x,x,z)$. If line 4 applies, then $F_2(x,z,z) = g_2(x,z,z) = g_1(x,x,z) = F_1(x,x,z)$, where the second equality is by the induction hypothesis, and the last equality is by the definition of F_1. Line 5 cannot apply for $F_2(x,z,z)$.

It remains to show that F_2 is arc preserving.

- Suppose that $\ell(x) < \ell(v_0) - 1$ or $\ell(x) > \ell(v_0) - 1$. As before, for each $w \in \{x,y,z\}$, $w \in V(T_0) \Leftrightarrow w' \in V(T_0)$. Therefore the same case of the above definition applies for both $F_2(x,y,z)$ and $F_2(x',y',z')$, and thus $F_2(x,y,z)F_2(x',y',z')$ is an arc of T.
- Suppose that $\ell(x) = \ell(v_0) - 1$. As before, we use the fact if $F_2(x',y',z') = v_0$, we are done.
  - If *line* 1 of the definition of F_2 applies for $F_2(x',y',z')$, then consider first when $x' \in V(T')$ and $y',z' \in V(T_0)$. Then $F_2(x',y',z') = F_1(x',x',v_0) = v_0$ (since $z' = v_0$)) by line 4 of the definition of F_1.

    Consider therefore the case when $x' \in V(T_0)$ and $y',z' \in V(T')$. Then $F_2(x',y',z') = F_1(v_0,v_0,z') = v_0$ by line 3 of the definition of F_1.
  - If *line* 2 of the definition of F_2 applies, then we can do a similar analysis as above.
  - If *line* 3 applies for $F_2(x',y',z')$, then $F_2(x',y',z') = f_2(v_0,v_0,v_0) = v_0$, since f_2 is conservative.
  - If *line* 4 applies for $F_2(x',y',z')$. Then line 4 applies for $F_2(x,y,z)$, so we are done by the induction hypothesis for g_2.
  - If *line* 5 applies, then $F_2(x',y',z') = v_0$.

□

Proof of Theorem 6.1. One direction is shown in Lemma 6.2. The other direction follows from the chain of implications outlined in the introduction, or we can use Lemma 10.4 in the Appendix B. □

6.2 A digraph with an HM-chain of length n but not n-1

Definition 6.3. *A* ladder *of height n is a digraph having the following arcs:* $a_0a_1, a_1a_2, \ldots, a_{n-1}a_n$, $b_0b_1, b_1b_2, \ldots, b_{n-1}b_n$, *and* $b_0a_1, b_1a_2, \ldots, b_{n-1}a_n$.

Theorem 6.4. *Let H be a ladder of height $n \geq 1$. Then H admits an HM-chain of conservative polymorphisms of length $n+1$, but not of length n.*

Proof. The proof follows from Lemmas 6.5 and 6.6 below. □

Lemma 6.5. *Let H be a ladder of height $n \geq 1$. Then H does not admit an HM-chain of conservative polymorphisms $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_n$ of length n.*

Proof. For ladder H we use the same notation as in Definition 6.3. Suppose for contradiction that $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ is an HM-chain of conservative polymorphisms of H. We show by induction that $f_i(a_i, a_i, b_i) = a_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and this will contradict the definition of an HM-chain of length n requiring that $f_n(a_n, a_n, b_n) = b_n$. Since a_0a_1, b_0a_1, b_0b_1 are arcs, $f_1(a_0, b_0, b_0)f_1(a_1, a_1, b_1)$ is an arc of H. Since $a_0 = f_1(a_0, b_0, b_0)$ (by definition), it follows that $f_1(a_1, a_1, b_1) = a_1$, so the base case holds. Assume the induction hypothesis holds for index i. Then $a_i = f_i(a_i, a_i, b_i) = f_{i+1}(a_i, b_i, b_i)$, and since $f_{i+1}(a_i, b_i, b_i)f_{i+1}(a_{i+1}, a_{i+1}, b_{i+1})$ is an arc of H, this arc can only be a_ia_{i+1}, so $f_{i+1}(a_{i+1}, a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}) = a_{i+1}$, and we are done. □

Lemma 6.6. *Let H be a ladder of height $n \geq 1$. Then H admits an HM-chain of conservative polymorphisms $f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_{n+1}$ of length $n+1$.*

Proof. For ladder H we use the same notation as in Definition 6.3. Notice that H is leveled. We argue now that it is sufficient to define polymorphisms for vertices x, y, z that are all in the same vertex level L_j of T, where $0 \leq j \leq n$. For suppose that $F_1', F_2', F_3' : L_0^3 \cup \cdots \cup L_m^3 \to T$ are operations that are edge-preserving, conservative, and satisfy all required identities. Then we can extend these to full operations with the same properties:

$$F_1(x,y,z) = \begin{cases} F_1'(x,y,z) & \text{if } x,y,z \in L_j \text{ for some } 0 \leq j \leq m, \text{ else} \\ x & \text{if } y,z \in L_j \text{ for some } 0 \leq j \leq m, \\ z & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and for $2 \leq i \leq n+1$,

$$F_i(x,y,z) = \begin{cases} F_i'(x,y,z) & \text{if } x,y,z \in L_j \text{ for some } 0 \leq j \leq m, \\ z & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The claimed properties of this extension are easy to check.

So let $x, y, z \in L_j$ for some $0 \leq j \leq n$. We define the operations $f_i(x, y, z)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n+1$ as shown below. (This definition is inspired by the definition of an HM-chain in Lemma 5.2 in [4].) Recall that f_i is conservative, so $f_i(x, x, x)$ is always required to be x. Also note that we won't discuss the cases in the proofs below which involve $f_i(x, x, x)$, since these cases are trivial to analyze.

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_i(a_j, a_j, b_j) &= a_j \quad \text{if } j+1 > i && (1)\\
&= b_j \quad \text{if } j+1 \leq i && (2)\\
f_i(a_j, b_j, b_j) &= b_j \quad \text{if } j+1 < i && (3)\\
&= a_j \quad \text{if } j+1 \geq i && (4)\\
f_i(b_j, a_j, b_j) &= a_j \quad \text{if } j+1 > i > n-j+1 && (5)\\
&= b_j \quad \text{otherwise} && (6)\\
f_i(b_j, b_j, a_j) &= b_j \quad \text{if } n-j+1 > i && (7)\\
&= a_j \quad \text{if } n-j+1 \leq i && (8)\\
f_i(b_j, a_j, a_j) &= a_j \quad \text{if } n-j+1 < i && (9)\\
&= b_j \quad \text{if } n-j+1 \geq i && (10)\\
f_i(a_j, b_j, a_j) &= b_j \quad \text{if } n-j+1 > i > j+1 && (11)\\
&= a_j \quad \text{otherwise.} && (12)
\end{aligned}
$$

We claim that these f_j form an HM-chain. By lines 4 and 10 of the definition of f_i, $f_1(x,y,y) = x$. By lines 2 and 8, $f_{n+1}(x,x,y) = y$. If $f_i(a_j, a_j, b_j) = a_j$, then $j+1 > i$ by line 1, so $j+1 \geq i+1$, thus $f_{i+1}(a_j, b_j, b_j) = a_j$ by line 4. Similarly, if $f_i(a_j, a_j, b_j) = b_j$, then $j+1 \leq i$ by line 2 so, $j+1 < i+1$, and therefore $f_{i+1}(a_j, b_j, b_j) = b_j$ by line 3. To sum up, $f_i(x,x,y) = f_{i+1}(x,y,y)$.

It remains to show that each f_i is arc preserving. In the first column of Table 1, we specify some $f_i(x,y,z)f_i(x',y',z')$ where xx', yy', zz' are arcs, $x,y,z \subseteq \{a_j, b_j\}$ and $x',y',z' \subseteq \{a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}\}$. We can assume that $f_i(x,y,z) = a_j$, since if $f_i(x,y,z) = b_j$, then $f_i(x,y,z)f_i(x',y',z')$ is an arc of H because both b_jb_{j+1} and b_ja_{j+1} are arcs. It is straightforward to check that Table 1 covers all cases.

□

7 A faster recognition algorithm

An algorithm that recognizes digraphs containing no circular N is given in [4]. However, [4] only shows that the algorithm runs in polynomial time. In Appendix A, we show that a direct implementation of this algorithm when inputs are restricted to oriented trees is guaranteed to run in $O(|V(T)|^8)$ time. The running time of the algorithm in this paper is $O(|V(T)|^3)$.

Theorem 7.1. *Let T be an oriented tree. Then there is a $O(|V(T)|^3)$ algorithm that decides whether T contains a Z_6 or a fuzzy* N *as induced subgraphs. (Equivalently, whether T contains a circular N.)*

Proof. For each $u, v \in V(T)$, we find the unique oriented path from u to v in T using, for example, breadth first search. For each such path $P(u,v)$, we test whether $P(u,v)$ is a Z_6, or if not, we run the test in the next paragraph. Clearly, checking whether $P(u,v)$ is a Z_6 takes constant time. If Z_6 is found, we output YES.

Otherwise, we run the following test on $P(u,v)$. Suppose that $P(u,v) = a_0 \dots a_n$ (where $a_0 = u$ and $a_n = v$). We traverse $P(u,v)$ from a_0 to a_n. We initialize a counter c to 0 at a_0, and increase and decrease c every time we move from a_i to a_{i+1}: if a_ia_{i+1} is forward arc, we increase c by 1, and if it is a backward arc, we decrease c by 1. If c becomes negative at any step, then we abandon the computation on $P(u,v)$ (and we move on to analyze $P(u'v')$ for the next pair $u'v' \in V(T)$). As we traverse $P(u,v)$, we keep track of the maximum value M of the counter c. Assume that we

Table 1: Cases in the proof of Lemma 6.6.

$f_i(a_j, b_j, b_j)f_i(a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}, b_{j+1})$	Since $f_i(a_j, b_j, b_j) = a_j$ by assumption, $j + 1 \geq i$ by line 4. Therefore $j + 2 \geq i$, so by line 4, $f_i(a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}, b_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$.
$f_i(a_j, b_j, b_j)f_i(a_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, b_{j+1})$	We note that $j + 1 \geq i$ as above, so $j + 2 > i$, and line 1 gives that $f_i(a_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$.
$f_i(a_j, b_j, b_j)f_i(a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}, a_{j+1})$	$j+1 \geq i \Rightarrow j+2 \geq i$, so by line 11 $f_i(a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$.
$f_i(b_j, a_j, b_j)f_i(a_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, b_{j+1})$	Since $f_i(b_j, a_j, b_j) = a_j$, $j + 1 > i > n - j + 1$ by line 5, we have that $j + 2 > i$, and therefore $f_i(a_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$ by line 1.
$f_i(b_j, a_j, b_j)f_i(b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, a_{j+1})$	Since $f_i(b_j, a_j, b_j) = a_j$, $j + 1 > i > n - j + 1$ by line 5, we have that $n - j < i$, and therefore $f_i(b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, a_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$ by line 9.
$f_i(b_j, a_j, b_j)f_i(b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, b_{j+1})$	Since $f_i(b_j, a_j, b_j) = a_j$, $j+1 > i > n-j+1$ by line 5, we have that $j+2 > i > n-j$, and therefore $f_i(b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$ by line 5.
$f_i(b_j, b_j, a_j)f_i(b_{j+1}, b_{j+1}, a_{j+1})$	Since $f_i(b_j, b_j, a_j) = a_j$, $n - j + 1 \leq i$ by line 8, we have that $n - j \leq i$, and therefore $f_i(b_{j+1}, b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$ by line 8.
$f_i(b_j, b_j, a_j)f_i(b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, a_{j+1})$	Since $f_i(b_j, b_j, a_j) = a_j$, $n - j + 1 \leq i$ by line 8, we have that $n - j < i$, and therefore $f_i(b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, a_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$ by line 9.
$f_i(b_j, b_j, a_j)f_i(a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}, a_{j+1})$	Since $f_i(b_j, b_j, a_j) = a_j$, $n - j + 1 \leq i$ by line 8, we have that $n - j > i$ is violated in line 11, so $f_i(a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$ by line 12.
$f_i(b_j, a_j, a_j)f_i(b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, a_{j+1})$	Since $f_i(b_j, a_j, a_j) = a_j$, $n - j + 1 < i$ by line 9, we have that $n - j < i$, so $f_i(b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, a_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$ by line 9.
$f_i(a_j, b_j, a_j)f_i(a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}, a_{j+1})$	Since $f_i(a_j, b_j, a_j) = a_j$, $n - j + 1 \leq i$ or $i \leq j + 1$ by line 12, so we have that $n - j \leq i$ or $i \leq j + 2$. Therefore by line 12, we have that $f_i(b_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, a_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$.
$f_i(a_j, a_j, b_j)f_i(a_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, b_{j+1})$	Since $f_i(a_j, a_j, b_j) = a_j$, $j + 1 > i$ by line 1, so $j + 2 > i$, and therefore line 1 gives that $f_i(a_{j+1}, a_{j+1}, b_{j+1}) = a_{j+1}$.

obtained the maximum value of M. If $M \leq 1$, then we abandon the computation on $P(u, v)$, and we move on to the next path $P(u', v')$. Otherwise $M \geq 2$. We set c to 0 again, and we traverse $P(u, v)$ again starting at a_0 as before, increasing and decreasing the value of c at each step. We set $b_1 = a_0$. If a_{k_1} is the first vertex where c attains the value M, we set $t_1 = a_{k_1}$. If a_{k_2} is the first vertex after a_{k_1} where c attains value 0, then we set $b_2 = a_{k_2}$. If a_{k_3} is the first vertex after a_{k_2} where c attains value M, then we set $t_2 = a_{k_3}$. If no such a_{k_1}, a_{k_2} and a_{k_3} exist, then we move on to the next path $P(u', v')$. Otherwise, we output YES.

If we finished testing all paths $P(u, v)$ and we never output YES, then we output NO. This completes the description of the algorithm.

If we output YES, then either T contains a Z_6, or the vertices b_1, t_1, b_2, t_2 for some $P(u, v)$ (defined above) satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.3, so T contains a fuzzy N.

Conversely, suppose that T contains a Z_6 or a fuzzy N having first vertex a and last vertex b.

Then since we cycled through all pairs of vertices of $u, v \in V(T)$, if T contains an induced Z_6 with first vertex a and last vertex b, the algorithm detects this Z_6 when $u = a$ and $v = b$. Similarly, if T contains an induced fuzzy N with first vertex a and last vertex b, then the algorithm finds b_1, t_1, b_2, t_2 satisfying the conditions of Lemma 3.3 when $u = a$ and $v = b$.

We cycle through all pairs $u, v \in V(T)$. For each such pair, we run a BFS to find $P(u, v)$, which takes time $O(|V(T)|)$ (recall that T is an oriented tree). We traverse $P(u, v)$ and keep track only of a constant amount of data during these traversals. Overall the running time is $O(|V(T)|^3)$. □

8 Conclusions and open problems

We sharpened results of [4] regarding LHOM(H) in the special case when H is an oriented tree. The next natural question is how far can we push these results: Is there an inductive construction and forbidden subgraph characterization of digraphs H for which LHOM(H) in L? If an inductive characterization exists, can it be used to provide a simpler logspace algorithm for LHOM(H)?

References

[1] Rajesh Hemant Chitnis, László Egri, and Dániel Marx. List H-coloring a graph by removing few vertices. In *Algorithms - ESA 2013 - 21st Annual European Symposium, Sophia Antipolis, France, September 2-4, 2013. Proceedings*, pages 313–324, 2013.

[2] Víctor Dalmau, László Egri, Pavol Hell, Benoit Larose, and Arash Rafiey. Descriptive complexity of list H-coloring problems in logspace: A refined dichotomy. In *30th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015*, pages 487–498, 2015.

[3] László Egri. *The Fine-Grained Complexity of Constraint Satisfaction Problems*. PhD thesis, McGill University, December 2012.

[4] László Egri, Pavol Hell, Benoit Larose, and Arash Rafiey. Space complexity of list H-colouring: a dichotomy. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 349–365, 2014.

[5] László Egri, Andrei A. Krokhin, Benoit Larose, and Pascal Tesson. The complexity of the list homomorphism problem for graphs. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 51(2):143–178, 2012.

[6] T. Feder, P. Hell, and J. Huang. List homomorphisms of graphs with bounded degrees. *Discrete Mathematics*, 307:386–392, 2007.

[7] T. Feder and M.Y. Vardi. Monotone monadic SNP and constraint satisfaction. In *Proceedings of 25th ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 612–622, 1993.

[8] Tomás Feder and Pavol Hell. List homomorphisms to reflexive graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 72(2):236–250, 1998.

[9] Tomás Feder, Pavol Hell, and Jing Huang. List homomorphisms and circular arc graphs. *Combinatorica*, 19(4):487–505, 1999.

[10] Tomás Feder, Pavol Hell, and Jing Huang. Bi-arc graphs and the complexity of list homomorphisms. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 42(1):61–80, 2003.

[11] G. Gutin, A. Rafiey, and A. Yeo. Minimum cost and list homomorphisms to semicomplete digraphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 154:890–897, 2006.

[12] Pavol Hell and Arash Rafiey. The Dichotomy of List Homomorphisms for Digraphs. In *Twenty-Second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2011, San Francisco, California, USA, January 23-25, 2011*, pages 1703–1713, 2011.

[13] Omer Reingold. Undirected connectivity in log-space. *Journal of the ACM*, 55(4), 2008.

9 Appendix A

For the sake of completeness, we give two characterizations of oriented paths that contain no Z_6 or fuzzy N as an induced subgraph. Let this class of oriented paths be denoted by $\mathcal{P}$. The first characterization is a special case of the inductive characterization of oriented trees. The other characterization gives an explicit "template" such that all oriented paths in $\mathcal{P}$ must obey this template. Roughly, this template specifies in what way certain fuzzy paths can be concatenated so that the resulting path is in $\mathcal{P}$.

9.1 Oriented Paths

Definition 9.1. *For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let P_i be either the empty digraph, or an oriented path that has a single vertex v_i in its top vertex level having outdegree 0. The operation of taking the disjoint union of P_1, P_2 and a single new vertex v_0, and then adding arcs v_1v_0 (if P_1 is non-empty) and v_2v_0 (if P_2 is non-empty) to the resulting digraph is called taking the* top up-join *of P_1 and P_2.*

Similarly, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let P_i be either the empty digraph, or an oriented path that has a single vertex v_i in its bottom vertex level having indegree 0. The operation of taking the disjoint union of P_1, P_2 and a single new vertex v_0, and then adding arcs v_1v_0 (if P_1 is non-empty) and v_2v_0 (if P_2 is non-empty) to the resulting digraph is called taking the bottom up-join *P_1 and P_2.*

We can similarly define the top down-join *and* bottom down-join *of two oriented paths.*

If P is an oriented path with a single vertex, we say that P is constructible*. Inductively, if P_1 and P_2 are constructible oriented paths (possibly empty), then their top up-join, bottom up-join, top down-join, bottom down-join (when allowed) are also* constructible*.*

Clearly, Definition 9.1 this is a special case of Definition 3.1. Therefore this construction does not produce an oriented path that contains an induced Z_6 or a fuzzy N as an induced subgraph. The converse is not difficult to prove, and a proof (using different terminology) can also be found in [3].

Theorem 9.2. *An oriented path P does not contain an induced Z_6 or fuzzy* N *if and only if P is constructible.*

Now we give the template characterization.

Definition 9.3. *An oriented path W is a* wave *if W is Z_k for some $1 \leq k \leq 5$, or W is of the form $Q_1A_1Q_2A_2 \dots Q_nA_n$, for some $n \geq 1$, where A_i and Q_i are defined as follows. Let $P_1, \dots, P_n$ be minimal fuzzy paths such that for each $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, $height(P_i) > height(P_{i+1})$. Then for each $1 \leq i \leq n$,*

- *if i is odd, then Q_i is of the form P_i, and A_i is of the form Z_1 or $\mathrm{Z}_3^{f=1}$, except that A_n (if n is odd) can be $\mathrm{Z}_j^{f=1}$ for any $j \leq 4$;*
- *if i is even, then Q_i is of the form $\bar{P}_i$, and A_i is Z_1 or $\mathrm{Z}_3^{f=0}$, except that A_n (if n is even) can be $\mathrm{Z}_j^{f=0}$ for any $j \leq 4$.*

Theorem 9.4. *Let P be an oriented path that does not contain a Z_6 or a fuzzy* N *as an induced subgraph. Then P has the form $\bar{U}AV$, or the form $r(\bar{U}AV)$, where U and V are waves, and A is either of the form Z_1 or $\mathrm{Z}_3^{f=0}$,*

Proof. Assume that $P = a_1 \dots a_n$. *To simplify notation, we write $P(i,j)$ instead of $P(a_i, a_j)$ (denoting the subpath of P starting at a_i and ending at a_j) in this proof.* We decompose P as $\bar{U}AV$ or $r(\bar{U}AV)$ for some $U = Q'_1A'_1Q'_2A'_2 \dots Q'_{m'}A'_{m'}$ and $V = Q_1A_1Q_2A_2 \dots Q_mA_m$, and A, where we are using the notation in Definition 9.3.

Let the levels of P be $L_0, \dots, L_h$, and assume that $h \geq 2$, since otherwise P is clearly a Z_k for some $1 \leq k \leq 5$. Let P_1 be a minimal fuzzy subpath of P of maximum height. We observe first that there can be at most 2 such paths. If there are more, we choose three arbitrary such subpaths R_1, R_2, R_3. Since $height(R_1) = height(R_2) = height(R_3) = h$, R_1, R_2, R_3 are edge-disjoint. So we can assume w.l.o.g that when we traverse P from first to last vertex, we first traverse the arcs of R_1, then the arcs of R_2, and finally the arcs of R_3. Since we have three paths, we can find two among them such that they both have their first vertices in L_0, or they both have their last vertices in L_h. Assume w.l.o.g. that R_1 and R_2 are such paths. Set b_1 and t_1 be the first and last vertices of P_1, and b_2 and t_2 be the first and last vertices of R_2. Clearly, b_1, t_1, b_2, t_2 satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.3. This contradicts that P contains no fuzzy N as an induced subgraph.

Therefore we assume first that P contains only one minimal fuzzy subpath of maximum height h. Let this subpath be $P_1 = P(i_1, j_1)$, where $i_1 < j_1$. We define V. We can assume w.l.o.g. that P_1 is an upward path, in which case we show that P has the form $\bar{U}AV$. (If P_1 is a downward path, then we can work with $r(P)$ and proceed the same way: we show that $r(P)$ has the form $\bar{U}AV$, and therefore P has the form $r(\bar{U}AV)$.)

We set $Q_1 = P_1$. We find i_2 ($j_1 \leq i_2$) maximal such that $P(j_1, i_2)$ has height at most 1, and $P(j_1, i_2)$ is either Z_1 or $Z_3^{f=0}$. We set A_1 to be $P(j_1, i_2)$. Then we find j_2 ($i_2 \leq j_2$) maximal such that $\bar{P}(i_2, j_2)$ is a minimal fuzzy path, and set $Q_2 = \bar{P}(i_2 j_2)$. Notice that $\bar{P}(i_2, j_2)$ can be chosen to be minimal, since otherwise either A_1 was chosen to be a Z_1 instead of $Z_3^{f=0}$, or if A_1 is a $Z_3^{f=0}$ and $\bar{P}(i_2, j_2)$ cannot be chosen to be minimal, then P contains a Z_6, a contradiction. Then we find A_2, similarly to the way we found A_1. We keep on defining Q_i and A_i this way until the following condition applies. For some ℓ, $Q_\ell = P(i_\ell, j_\ell)$ (or $Q_\ell = \bar{P}(i_\ell, j_\ell)$) is defined, and the rest of P, i.e., $P(j_\ell, n)$ has height at most 1 ($\star$). Then we set $A_\ell = P(j_\ell, n)$, and this completes the construction of V. We show below that $height(Q_i) > height(Q_{i+1})$, which clearly that condition ($\star$) will eventually occur. Therefore the definition of V is valid. Notice that A_ℓ is some Z on at most 4 vertices, since otherwise A_ℓ together with the last arc of Q_ℓ would form a Z_6.

We already saw that the A_i have the right form. To prove that V is a wave, it remains to show that $height(Q_i) > height(Q_{i+1})$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. By the choice of Q_1 we have that $height(Q_1) > height(Q_2)$. Assume inductively that $height(Q_i) > height(Q_{i+1})$, and assume for contradiction that $height(Q_{i+1}) \leq height(Q_{i+2})$. As before, it is easy to use Lemma 3.3 to show the presence of a fuzzy N in P, which gives a contradiction.

If the subpath $a_{j_1-2}a_{j_1-1}a_{j_1}$ has height 1, then we choose A to be this subpath. Otherwise, A is just a_{j_1}. U is the subpath $a_t a_{t-1} \dots a_1$, where $t = j_1$ if A is a_{j_1}, and $t = j_1 - 2$ otherwise. As for V, we can show that U is a wave.

Assume now that P contains two minimal fuzzy subpaths R_1 and R_2 of maximum height h. Suppose w.l.o.g. that the arcs of R_1 appear before the arcs of R_2 in P. We also assume w.l.o.g. the R_1 is a downward path (if R_1 is upward path, we can work with $r(P)$ as above). Then R_2 must be an upward path such either R_1R_2 is a subpath of P, or R_1AR_2 is a subpath of P, where A is a $Z_3^{f=0}$. This A corresponds to the A in $\bar{U}AV$ the statement of the lemma. We define V to be the subpath of P starting with R_2 and ending at a_n, and $\bar{U}$ to be the subpath of P starting ata_1 and ending with R_1. The proof that U and V are waves is similar to the proof of the first case above. □

9.2 Running time analysis

We give a running time analysis of the recognition algorithm in Theorem 6.8 of [4] when run an oriented tree. We call this algorithm the N-algorithm. Note that we did not attempt to optimize the implementation of this algorithm, and it is possible that the running time could be improved with some work.

The N-algorithm first produces a digraph G^{++} with vertex set $|V(H)|^3$. If H is a tree, then G^{++} cannot have a cycle (see the definition of G^{++} in [4]), so it must be a forest. It follows that G^{++} has at most $O(|V(H)|^3)$ arcs. Then for each $x, y \in V(H)$, the N-algorithm finds the set $S_{(x,x,y)}$ of all vertices reachable from (x, x, y) ignoring certain arcs of G^{++}, and finds the set $S_{(x,y,y)}$ of all vertices reachable from (x, y, y) ignoring some other certain arcs of G^{++}. Using BFS, each such search could take $O(|V(H)|^3)$ time. The size of each $S_{(x,x,y)}$ and $S_{(x,y,y)}$ could be $O(|V(H)|^3)$. Then the N-algorithm checks if $S_{(x,x,y)} \cap S_{(x,y,y)}$ is non-empty, for each $x, y \in V(H)$. This can be done in time $O(|V(H)|^2 \cdot (|V(H)|^3)^2) = O(|V(H)|^8)$.

10 Appendix B: alternative proofs

Lemma 10.1. *If an oriented tree T is constructible, then T contains neither a* Z_6 *nor a fuzzy* N *as an induced subgraph.*

Proof. Assume that T is the up-join of $T_0, \ldots, T_n$, and $T_0, \ldots, T_n$ do not contain a Z_6 or fuzzy N as an induced subgraph. Clearly, T can contain a Z_6 only in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(v_0)-1}$. Note that by Definition 3.1, each T_i contains at most one component in $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(v_0)-1}$, which is an out-star since T_i contains at most one vertex in $L_{\ell(v_0)-1}$ with out-degree more than 0. It follows that level $\mathcal{L}_{\ell(v_0)-1}$ of T is an in-spider, and therefore it does not contain a Z_6 as an induced subgraph.

Suppose that T contains a fuzzy N denoted by N. Let $P_1, \bar{P}_2, P_3$ the subpaths of N as defined in Definition 2.2. Let t_1 be the last vertex of P_1, and b_2 be the first vertex of P_2. Let $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_n$ be the central and join vertices of T. Since $T_0, \ldots, T_n$ do not contain a fuzzy N, N must contain an arc of the form $v_i v_0$, where we assume without loss of generality that $i = 1$. It follows that N must contain vertices both in $L_{\ell(v_0)}$ and $L_{\ell(v_1)}$.

We show that N cannot contain a vertex both in $L_{\ell(v_0)+1}$ and $L_{\ell(v_1)-1}$, contradicting that N has height at least 2. Assume first that N contains a vertex in $L_{\ell(v_0)+1}$. By the definition of a fuzzy N, then each of P_1, $\bar{P}_2$ and P_3 must contain a vertex in $L_{\ell(v_0)+1}$. Consider j such that t_1 is a vertex of T_j. Suppose first that $j \neq 0$. Then both P_1 and $\bar{P}_2$ have their first vertex in T_j. Also, both P_1 and $\bar{P}_2$ must contain a vertex in $L_{\ell(v_1)}$. Since v_j is the only vertex of T_j in $L_{\ell(v_1)}$ with more than zero outneighbours in T_j, both P_1 and $\bar{P}_2$ must contain v_j. But then T_j must contain a cycle, contradicting that T_j is a tree. If $j = 0$, then since v_0 is the only vertex of T_0 with inneighbours in $L_{\ell(v_1)}$, both P_1 and $\bar{P}_2$ must contain a v_0, and thus T_0 contains a cycle. This is impossible.

Assume therefore that N contains a vertex in $L_{\ell(v_1)-1}$. We find j such that b_2 is a vertex of T_j. As above, it follows that both $\bar{P}_2$ and P_3 contain vertex v_j, indicating that T_j contains a cycle. This is a contradiction.

The analysis is analogous when T is obtained using a down-join operation. □

The proof of the following lemma is easy, or it can be extracted from [4].

Lemma 10.2. *Let H be a digraph. Then if H contains a circular* N *with congruent walks $X = x_0 x_1 \ldots x_n$, where $x_0 = x_n = x$, $Y = y_0 y_1 \ldots y_n$, where $y_0 = y_n = y$, and $Z = z_0 z_1 \ldots z_n$, where $z_0 = y$ and $z_n = x$, then H has the following* implication property. *Let $P = p_0 p_1 \ldots p_n$ be an*

oriented path congruent to X (and hence also to Y and Z) with lists $L(p_i) = \{x_i, y_i, z_i\}$, for each $0 \leq i \leq n$. Then there are list homomorphisms φ_{xx}, φ_{yy}, and φ_{yx}, each from P to H such that

- $\varphi_{xx}(p_0) = \varphi_{xx}(p_n) = x$,
- $\varphi_{yy}(p_0) = \varphi_{yy}(p_n) = y$,
- $\varphi_{yx}(p_0) = y$ *and* $\varphi_{yx}(p_n) = x$,

and there is no list homomorphism φ_{xy} from P to H such that φ_{xy} maps p_0 to x and p_n to y.

Lemma 10.3. *If an oriented tree T contains a circular* N*, then it contains a* Z_6 *or a fuzzy* N *as an induced subgraph.*

Proof. We show that if T contains neither an induced Z_6 nor a fuzzy N, then T cannot have the implication property. This implies by Lemma 10.2 that T cannot have a circular N.

Since we are assuming that T has no induced Z_6 or fuzzy N, T is the up-join (or down-join) of some trees $T_0, \ldots, T_n$. We suppose that the central vertex is v_0, and the join vertices are $v_1, \ldots, v_n$. We assume that T is the up-join and note that the analysis for down-join is similar. We inductively assume that we already showed that none of $T_0, \ldots, T_n$ contains a circular N (since they do not contain an induced Z_6 or fuzzy N). Therefore the fuzzy N in T must contain an arc $v_i v_0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let X (with first vertex x), Y (with first vertex y) and Z be the congruent walks making up the circular N in T, and let $P = p_0 \ldots p_n$ be a path congruent to X. Let φ_{xx}, φ_{yy}, and φ_{yx} be the list homomorphisms associated with the implication property from Lemma 10.2. Informally, all arguments below will use the fact that v_0 is a "bottleneck vertex" in T.

Suppose first that $x \in V(T_{j_x})$ and $y \in V(T_{j_y})$. *Assume that $j_x \neq j_y$.* Let p_α and p_β be vertices of P such that

- α is minimum such that $\varphi_{yx}(p_\alpha) = v_0$,
- if $p_\alpha p_{\alpha+1}$ is a forward arc,
  - then let β be minimum such that $\alpha < \beta$, $\varphi_{yx}(p_\beta) = v_0$, and $p_\beta p_{\beta+1}$ is a backward arc
  - otherwise set $\beta = \alpha$.

It is not difficult to see that such α and β must exist. This is because P is a path, so the image of P in T must contain a path between y and x, and such a path must enter T_0 through v_0 and it must also leave T_0 through v_0. Observe that it follows from the above definition that the image of $P(p_\alpha, p_\beta)$ under φ_{yx} is entirely in T_0.

We modify φ_{xx} as

$$\varphi'_{xx}(u) = \begin{cases} \varphi_{xx}(u) \text{ if } u \text{ is not a vertex of } P(p_\alpha, p_\beta) \\ \varphi_{yx}(u) \text{ if } u \text{ is a vertex of } P(p_\alpha, p_\beta) \end{cases}$$

We claim that φ'_{xx} is a list homomorphism from P to T. Clearly, we only need to check that arcs $p_{\alpha-1}p_\alpha$ and $p_\beta p_{\beta+1}$ are mapped to an arc of T. Since p_α has indegree 1 (by minimality of α), and p_α is mapped to a vertex in level $L_{\ell(v_0)}$, $p_{\alpha-1}$ must be mapped to v_i for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. (Recall that $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ are the only vertices of $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ in level $L_{\ell(v_0-1)}$ with outdegree greater than zero.) So $\varphi'_{xx}(p_{\alpha-1}) = v_i$ and $\varphi'_{xx}(p_\alpha) = v_0$, and thus $p_{\alpha-1}p_\alpha$ is mapped to an arc of T. An analogous argument shows that $p_\beta p_{\beta+1}$ is also mapped to an arc. In addition, we can show in a similar way that we can construct φ'_{yy} that agrees with φ_{yy} everywhere, except that it takes the value of φ_{yx} on vertices of $P(p_\alpha, p_\beta)$.

Now we can construct φ_{xy}, the list homomorphism that maps p_0 to x and p_n to y showing that T does not have the implication property. The function φ_{xy} on $P(p_0, p_{\alpha-1})$ is φ'_{xx}. On $P(p_\alpha, p_\beta)$, φ_{xy} is φ_{yx}, and on $P(p_{\beta+1}, p_n)$, φ_{xy} is φ'_{yy}. Since $\varphi'_{xx}(p_\alpha) = \varphi_{yx}(p_\alpha) = v_0$, and $\varphi_{yx}(p_\beta) = \varphi'_{yy}(p_n) = v_0$, φ_{xy} is a list homomorphism from P to T, giving a contradiction.

Assume therefore that $j_x = j_y$. Then if φ_{yx} maps any vertex of P to v_0, then we can use the same argument as above. If φ_{yx} does not map any vertex of P to v_0, then at least one of φ_{xx} or φ_{yy} must map a vertex of P to v_0, since otherwise there would be a circular N entirely in T_{j_x}, contradicting the induction hypothesis. A similar argument can be used to construct a list homomorphism φ_{xy} mapping p_0 to x and p_n to y from φ_{xx} and φ_{yy}. The existence of φ_{xy} gives a contradiction.

The remaining cases can be analyzed in a very similar way, and therefore we give only brief arguments. Assume that $x, y \in T_0$. Let φ be any list homomorphism associated with the implication property. Then we have that $\varphi(p_0), \varphi(p_n) \in \{x, y\}$.

Let α and β be such that

- α is minimum such that $\varphi(p_\alpha) \in L_{\ell(v_0)}$, and $p_\alpha p_{\alpha+1}$ is a backward arc. (Note that such an α must exist since otherwise there is a circular N entirely in T_0.)
- β is maximum such that $\varphi(p_\beta) \in L_{\ell(v_0)}$, and $p_{\beta-1} p_\beta$ is a forward arc.

Note that φ (any of the list homomorphisms associated with the implication property) maps p_α and p_β to v_0. Therefore let φ_{xy} be the function that is φ_{xx} on vertices of $P(p_0, p_\beta)$, and φ_{yy} on vertices of $P(\beta + 1, n)$. Since $\varphi_{xx}(p_\beta) = v_0 = \varphi_{yy}(p_\beta)$, φ_{xy} is a list homomorphism, and we have the desired contradiction.

Assume next that $x \in V(T_0)$ and $y \in V(T_q)$ for some $1 \leq q \leq n$. (The case when $x \in V(T_0)$ and $y \in V(T_q)$ can be analyzed similarly.) We define α and β as in the previous case. When φ (above) is φ_{xx}, $\varphi_{xx}(p_\alpha) = \varphi_{xx}(p_\beta) = v_0$. Then let φ_{xy} be the function that is φ_{xx} on vertices of $P(p_0, p_\beta)$, and φ_{yy} on vertices of $P(p_{\beta+1}, p_n)$. As before, we can check that φ_{xy} is a list homomorphism, and we have the desired contradiction. □

Lemma 10.4. *Let T be an oriented tree. If T contains a* Z_6 *or a fuzzy* N *as an induced subgraph, then T does not have conservative polymorphisms f_1, f_2 and f_3 that form a Hagemann-Mitschke chain.*

Proof. If T contains a Z_6 or a fuzzy N as an induced subgraph, then T contains a circular N by Theorem 5.1. If T contains a circular N, then T does not have conservative polymorphisms that form a Hagemann-Mitschke chain of any length by [4]. □